

THE *B. Bell.*
CATHOLIKE
MODERATOR:
OR *3939 aaa 38*
1-6
A MODERATE
EXAMINATION
OF THE DOCTRINE
of the PROTESTANTS.

Prouing against the too rigid CATHOLIKES
of these times, and against the Arguments especially, of
that Booke called, *The Answer to the Catholike Apologie*, That we,
who are members of the CATHOLIKE, APOSTOLIKE, & ROMAN
CHVRCH, ought not to condemne the PROTESTANTS for
HERETIKES, vntill further prooffe be made.

First written in French by a Catholike Gentleman,
and now faithfully translated.

See the occasion of the name of HVGVENOTS,
after the Translators Epistle.

LONDON,
Printed for NATHANIEL BUTTER.

1633.



THE TRANSLATER TO the Christian Readers.

AND TO ALL THOSE ESPECIAL-
ly, whose hard hap it is, or may be, to be sedu-
ced *unto Popery: That by the helpe of this Booke,*
and their owne Prayers, they may be deliuered
from the the Euill, when the Priests and Iesuits
*would Lead them into temp-
tation.*

Here is a bold Nation of men (the Temp-
ters aboue mentioned I meane) slyly of late
crept in amongst you (well-meaning and
abused people) whose enticements (as you
know too well) still begin with the Church;
saying you *Protestants* are direct Hereticks,
you haue no Church: Are you therefore reconciled to the
Church? Meaning all this time the *Romane* Church. Had
they fairely meant the Catholike Church, I know no *Calui-
nist* that hath put this Article out of his Creed, *I beleeeue in the
holy Catholike Church.* And to say, *I beleeeue:* What else im-
plies it, but to beleeeue himselfe to be of it; else, why his
Creed? That therefore you may make one *Romanist* to an-
swer all the rest; doe but turne him, that would seduce you,
vnto these two first Chapters; and he shall there finde, that
for those few points of Reformation, both in matter of Do-
ctrine and Ceremonie, wherein the *Protestants* haue iustly
dissented from the *Papists*; we can be no Heretiques. And
that their owne new Doctors, who boast so much of Anti-
quitie, can no where shew our Doctrine to be sufficiently
condemned, before the time of that fifth Gospell of the *Ro-
manists*

The Translator to the Reader.

manifests, the Councell of *Trent* I meane, which ended no more than some 60 yeeres agoe; the third Chapter will evidently shew them. And how incompetent a Iudge an Aduersarie is, and how vnlawfull a Councell that of *Trent* was, the Instances of the fourth and fifth Chapters will euince it. Lastly, that we Protestants, hauing euer continued true members of the true, holy, and catholique Church, doe not now need any Reconciliation to theirs of *Rome*, the last Chapter will abundantly demonstrate it. Which six Chapters being written by a Gentleman, who euery where professes himselfe one of theirs, if they would offer to shift off (as they haue euasions enow) by saying that what is written in this Booke, is but the opinion of one Doctor: Loe then, we haue not only the Authors opinions, but the strength of his reasons to vrge them withall. All which are so mannerly, so directly, and so succinctly toucht vpon, and come off so handsomely, as no man (in my opinion) hath yet said better, that purposed to say so little.

To giue you therefore the minde of the Authour in a word: Nothing was here written, with any intention to vrge vs Protestants, any whit to depart from our Right in yeelding to a Reconciliation with them; but to perswade them rather, to esteeme better of vs: and to demonstrate withall, that if they will iudge right, they must needs thinke well. And this is the purpose of the Translator also. To shew you therefore to vnderstand all this Booke: If the Reader shall sometimes feele, that this Author now and then giues the Protestants a light fillip by the way; he shall obserue in the conclusion, that it was to reach his owne Romanists, a smarter blow; which is satisfaction enough. And that hee giues vs any at all, let vs but consider, that the Author though he were a moderate man, yet that he was withall a Papist, and it will take away much of the scandall. Lastly,
which

The Translator to the Reader.

which will giue vs as much aduantage as we can desire from one man, which is to answer them by one of their owne; this Gentleman the Author *H. C.* was too well knowne here in *England* to haue continued a most zealous Roman Catholique vntill his dying day, and yet neuertheless are all his Reasons for Moderation, directed to the Papists, as if they should first begin it; and all his conclusions directly for the Protestants, as though we should still hold them. Nay and which is somewhat more; whereas all this is with vs of *England*, common to our Brethren the Protestants of *France*, yet doth this Booke make more for vs at home, than it doth for them, for whose sakes it was first written. For though we haue with them entertained the points of Reformation; yet haue we not so far receded from the more Primitiue Roman Church (which he stands for) but that we still retaine more of the necessarie Ceremonies, Solemnities, and Church Discipline, than they of *France* haue done; witnesse his second Chapter of Ceremonies; which is still for our aduantage.

As therefore this little Booke hath beene twice already printed in *France*, which is an Argument of the Protestants good liking of it there; so hath it foure or fise seuerall times, both by Diuines and Gentlemen of our owne Religion, been translated both into Latine and English, which is a demonstratiue Reason to me, how much it hath beene lik'd and desired. To saue therefore the labour of writing it out, which I still obserued, as many desirous to doe as could get Copies of it, I haue thought fit to let mine be published: desiring all those that light vpon it, to be as impartiall and charitable, as the Author himselfe wishes them; which if they be, I hope well that the strictest need not be offended, and the well-minded may reape much benefit by it. Which being my only desire, I shall euer pray for.



THE FIRST OCCASION

how the name of HUGUENOTS,
which our Author euery where vseth,
came first to be giuen to the
French PROTESTANTS.

THere is euer some Salt as well as Gall in malice, and this temper makes it sometimes bitterly witty; as may appeare by this name of Huguenots, by which and no other, doe the French Papists generally vouchsafe to call the Protestants. It was taken up about the yeere 1559. which was some foure or five yeeres before Mr. Calvins death. Till which time they were called Tourengaux, of the Citie of Tours, where the Protestants mostly vsed: But about that time, there hauing beene a foolish opinion, of a Night-Spirits walking up and downe the streets, which they called King Hugon: This fancie made one of the Citie Gates to be called King Hugons Gate; and the Protestants being once obserued in the night to goe thorow that Gate vnto their Assemblies and holy Exercises; were hereupon called Huguenots. He that will see more of this Name, and the occasion of it, may finde a handsome Discourse of it in Monlieur Pasquiers Recherches, lib. 7. cap. 52. whither I refer you.



TO
ALL THE KINGS
FAITHFUL SVBIECTS,
and principally to those *Catholikes*,
that are desirous of the quiet of the
Church and State.

HERE are now thirty yeeres and more
(at severall times) since we haue had per-
petuall warres with the *Huguenots*, as with
Rebels and Heretikes; though we haue
perceiued of late, that our former opinion
was wrongfully conceiued against them: and we may
be also mistaken in the latter; and that time, which hath
made it appeare, that they are not Rebels, may discover
likewise vnto vs that they are not Heretikes. But howso-
euer, it were much to be wished in the meane time, that
we would entertaine a charitable conceit of them, till
there be more euidence giuen in against them.

The bitter dissention in Religion, hath beene the
spring-head of all our miseries. That was it, which
brought them forth at first, and which yet nurseth them:
whence it is now come to passe, that those men who are

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

at this present, disturbers of the State, haue at the very selfe-same time begun to raise tumults in the Realme, and to reuiue and exasperate the differences which we haue in Religion: In such fashion, as that the practises of the principall Leaguers, and the turbulent Sermons of diuers Preachers (for I blame not all) haue beene (as it were) *Hippocrates* twins, who went alwaies together, laught alwaies together; and it may chance, that these also may weepe together: and we haue seene the experience of it, that the tongues of the one haue done more mischief than the swords of the other.

See the cause then, why in the beginning of these late troubles, the Catholike Apologie hath laboured to qualifie this heat, and to confute the slanders giuen out against the Reformed Religion, and those of it. Which Apologie hath beene in part refuted, but so coldly, that no proofes which the Confuter produceth, could make me see any reason, why we should so peremptorily condemne the *Huguenots* for Heretikes, although differing from vs, about the explication of some points of Religion. Vpon which I was indued a yeere since & more, to answer the Reasons aforesaid. But finding the Arguments to be of great weight, I iudged it fitter to write a iust Treatise thereof by it selfe, than to answer the objections hudled vp together by another man: which hath caused mee also both to suppress that which I had written already, and to defer that which I purposed to write. And longer I suppose I had deferred it, if these late Tragedies acted in the murthers of our two last Kings, had not put me in the conceit of it, how that these horrid Acts sprung from the selfe-same fountaine, and that only vpon this ground too, namely, *That the Errours of*
the

Henry 3.

Henry 4.

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

the Huguenots are so exceedingly enormous; they found their *Maximes*, by which they perswade themselves; That a man may take any course lawfull or vnlawfull, to destroy them and their fauourers.

Another motiue I also had, which induced me to proceed in my purpose of writing. Which was the consideration of the fortunate proceedings of our late King HENRY (whom his enemies made to be called, Great) all the time that he continued Protestant: Then whose troubles we need seeke no further example, to shew how God both dislikes mans bloudie courses, and disposes also of his owne proceedings, his owne way. For God neuer produces any extraordinary euent, without some extraordinary Designe. But how extraordinarily God in the beginning fauoured his Maiestie, whiles he continued Protestant, none knowes so well as his enemies, forasmuch as God made vse of their courses, for his advancement. They conceited it, that by embroyling *France* in Ciuill warres, to haue ruined him; and these warres haue increased his honour and power. They, impatient of delayes, thought presently by vniustifiable practises, to haue vrged the late King^a to haue^a Henry 3. prosecuted him with more violence, than he had done heretofore; and these plots of theirs, haue been both the causes of the vtter ruine of his enemies, and of his reconcilment to the King. Briefly, his enemies thrust Armes into his hands for their owne destructions: and those deuices by which they had thought to haue chased him out of *Guyen*, haue brought him into the heart of *France*; and by the selfe-same meanes whereby they thought to take away his life, they haue
giuen

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

giuen him the Kingdome. May wee imagine that God had no designe, in the bringing about of these purposes? Or what else may wee gather out of all this; but that God is angry, when we will not permit him to dispose of his owne Church, his owne way, but deuise to preuent him by our owne wisdomes? For which respect, I protest before God, that had I beene the sorest enemy that the King had had, yet should I thinke that for no other reason God had so many wayes fauoured him, than to punish vs, who by vniustifiable practises out of an impatient zeale, would haue rooted out the Reformed Religion, though erroneous.

Haply then it may fall out, that if wee alter our courses, God will also change his. And as those designs of ours, by which we verily thought to haue aduanced our Religion haue hindred it: So God also may turne the same meanes which we feared would hinder our Religion, to the aduancement of it. In the meane time let vs know thus much; That God neuer blesses those mens courses, which thinke to anticipate him through impatience. Let vs then haue patience a while; and when wee shall perceiue the times of peace to be fittest for our purposes, let vs (a Gods name) offer the same conditions vnto the *Huguenots*, which they propounded vnto vs before; which was, to assemble the best learned men in both Religions, to discusse friendly the points in controuersie; to the end, that the quiet of the Common-wealth, may goe along with that of the Church: which if the *Huguenots* shall accept of, (as I make no doubt but they will) I perswade my selfe, that there may be such a course

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

course taken in the Conference, that discovery may be made of many things, which haue beene concealed hitherto from both of vs. Not that I imagine any noueltie can be found out in Religion, (God forbid that I should euer thinke so) but that the meaner questions in controuersie, being reconciled, the impertinent ones omitted, the greater may be insisted vpon, to be cleared by more euident demonstrations.

Nor can either partie (considering the points be already sufficiently discussed) imagine that such a conference would be vnprofitable; for although there can hardly be found more solid Arguments, than those wherewith we haue serued our selues heretofore; yet is it one thing to proue, and another thing to satisfie: now wee must not so much maintaine a side, to vanquish; as to winne those that are in the wrong. And thus much I dare say, and I will be able to make good against any contradiction; that neither partie, haue in any conference as yet taken that course, which they ought and might haue followed, for the satisfaction of the aduerse partie, and the clearing of doubts.

For mine owne part, though I be the meanest of a Million, who haue embroyled themselves in the disputes of the time, yet dare I vndertake to reduce the points in controuersie to so short an issue, and to set downe such a course for the handling thereof; that more of the truth shall be discovered in this one conference, than in all the other disputes, which haue beene since *Martin Luther* first opposed himselfe against the Pope. For both the issue shall bee so

A

drawne,

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

drawne, and the meanes so disposed of; that the persons of neither Religion (keeping themselves to their owne proper *Maximes*) shall be able to reiect them. I should be too impudent to giue it out, if I were not well assured of my abilitie for the performance. But I am acquainted well enough with the euasions of either side, I know their fallacies, and I haue also the Art to preuent them.

But the time seemes not to be yet so fit, for wee must haue our spirits quiet, as well as our State; and aboue all, free from that same preiudication. For if we *Catholikes* come to a Disputation, being confident before hand, that the *Huguenets* are already condemned for Heretikes: And they on the other side, that they vnderstand the Scriptures better than *S. Austin*, and that all is cleare on their side; to what purpose serues such a Conference? The Priests and Ministers may seeme as confident as they please, for they are our Teachers; but we should not be so resolute, for we are but Learners. The end which they propose, is the Victorie; but the end which we seeke for, is the Truth. Which if wee haue found, why looke we further? But if we beleue without searching, we may very well be deceiued.

The chiefe reason then, which induced me to reassume my designe of writing in this point of Moderation, was; that our spirits being something pacified, wee might be the better prepared to a Conference, and in that Conference make discouery of the Truth; and by discouery of the Truth, establish a Peace in the Church of God. But I suspecting mine owne insufficiencie, and fearing withall to bestow
my

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

my labour in vaine: and on the other side, being wondrously desirous to see an vnion in Religion, I chose rather to hazard that paines which I had already taken, in publishing that answer which I had made before, than to lose a new.

The reason then why I that am a *Catholike*, doe rather blame the rigour of ours against the *Huguenots*, than theirs against vs (both parties being faulty much alike) is; because he that would reforme another, must begin at himselfe.

The importunitie and arrogancie of mine Aduersarie, vrge me sometimes to write not so like a *Catholike*, which I doe not purposely to confute the *Catholike Religion*: but to shew only; That the errors of the *Huguenots* are not so grosse, as our side perswades themselues they are. And knowing also that no one thing hath more suppressed the Truth, than the meane esteeme that the one partie hath of the others Arguments. Which (God knowes) is meerly out of ignorance; forsomuch as the deeper learned any man is, the more difficultie he finds in confuting his Aduersarie. For it is most certaine, that *Ignorance* engenders *Vehemencie*, and *Vehemencie* blinds vs from discovering the Truth. For their ignorance that are in the rights, makes those likewise the more vehement that are in the error; and the ignorance of those that are in error, blinds them the more.

See then the true intent of this my Discourse: wherein though I may perchance haue vsed some Reasons, which in too rigorous a Iudgement, may be esteemed with the most, in fauour of these new opinions; yet is not my intent, with them to seduce

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

any man, or to turne them from the Faith of their forefathers, but only to purge their spirits from preiudication vntill further prooffe be made. And if such prooffe be made (without which I conceiue no hope of vnion in the Church) I adiure thee (beloued Reader, of whether Religion soeuer thou beest) to come with a spirit void of this preiudication: Such a spirit I wish to thee, as I protest I my selfe haue; and I pray God to confirme in all of vs. *Amen.*

The Argument of the Booke.



He Catholique Apologie hath endencured to acquit the Huguenots of heresie by two Reasons. The first is, for that the Religion pretended to be Reformed, is not hereticall of it selfe, for that the substance of the Catholique Faith is receined by the Huguenots, and that the Ceremonies which they haue reiected, were unknowne to the ancient Church, of which two points, viz. Doctrine and Ceremonies, all Religion is composed. The second is, that their Religion hath not beene as yet condemned by any lawfull Iudgement: because that before the Councell of Trent, it was not condemned in any Generall Councell, and that the Councell of Trent is neither lawfull of it selfe, nor as yet approued of in France. Vpon which consideration, albeit that the Huguenots had wandered from the true faith, yet ought we not to proceed against them, as against Heretiques, untill they haue receined an arrest of condemnation from a generall Councell: no more then we can in iustice put a Malefactor to death, although he be notoriously culpable, untill he be cast by the Iury, and hath had his triall.

The Author now of the Answer to this Apologie, in the second part of his booke, from the fifth Chapter to the fifteenth, trauailes hard to refute the foresaid Reasons: in the fifth Chapter, he only propounds his Method; in the sixth, hee would shew, that the Religion of the Huguenots is quite another from that of the Catholiques; in the seventh, that the Ceremonies of the moderne Church of Rome were obserued in the Primitiue Church; in the eight, that the Doctrine pretended to be Reformed, stands condemned by an-

The Argument of the Booke.

cient Councils : in the 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. he defends the Councell of Trent ; whereof the 11, 12, and 13. are to proue, that that Councell is absolutely lawfull, and the 9, 10, and 14. that it is receiued in France : after which method I will also diuide my defence into these six Chapters.

1. In my first, I will proue against the reasons of his sixt Chapter, that the Catholiques and Huguenots thus farre agree in Doctrine, that they are both of one and the same Faith and Religion.

2. In my second, against his seuenth Chapter, that neither the Catholiques, nor the Huguenots, doe accord with the Primitiue Church in the matter of Ceremonies : and that for this reason the Huguenots are not to be condemned.

3. In my third, against his eighth, that before the times of the Councell of Trent, they stood not publikely and lawfully condemned.

4. In my fourth, against his 11, 12, and 13. Chapters, that the Councell of Trent is not lawfull.

5. In my fifth, against his 9, 10, and 14. Chapter, that it is not receiued in France.

6. In my sixth and last I will conclude, that the Huguenots may by good right be still reputed for members of the Catholique, Apostolique, and Roman Church.



CHAP. I.

That the Catholikes and Huguenots thus farre forth agree in Doctrine, that they are both of the same Faith and Religion.



IT is most cleare, that men of the same Church and Religion, may differ neuertheleſſe about ſome opinions in Diuinitie. *Auſten* accords not to *Hierome*, nor *Epiphanius* to *Chryſoſtome*, nor *Cyprian* to *Cornelius*, nor *Irenaeus* to *Victor*, and queſtionleſſe one of them was in the errour; yet were they all Doctours, approued by the Church, and Saints euery one of them. Euery errour doth not ſeparate a man from the Church, nor ſhould we regard ſo much the number, as the qualitie of them. *Arrius* accorded with the *Catholikes* in all points but one; inſomuch as the change of a word, yea of one bare letter, would haue compounded the controuerſie; and yet was he the greateſt Heretike, that euer the Church was troubled with. *Origen*, on the other ſide, diſſented in infinite Tenents, from the other old Doctours, and was yet neuertheleſſe eſteemed a member of the Church. ὁ μωύστον.
ὁ μοιύστον.

To ſee then, whether the *Huguenots* be of another Religion than wee, neither their errors, nor their numbers is the thing which is ſo much to be regarded, but the nature of them only is it: That is to ſay; what Errors are

to be reputed for Heresies, and whether theirs be of that nature.

There be two things which (according to the opinion of the *Catholikes*) make Errors to proue Heresies. The one, when the Errour is of it selfe so enormous, that he is at all times an Heretike that holds it. So that euen before the *Nicene Councell* had decided it, *Ebion*, *Paulus Samosetanus*, and *Arrius* stood then as Heretikes, for that they denied the eternall Diuinitie of the Sonne of God.

The second thing which (according to our opinion) makes an Errour to become an Heresie, is; when any man maintains an opinion in point of Doctrin, contrary to the Decrees of a Generall Councell. So then, the Heresie lies not so much in the mischieuousnesse of the opinion, as in the resistance made against the ordinance of the Church. For example: The opinion of *S. Cyprian* touching Rebaptization, was not Heresie in him, because there was not as then any Decree of Councell made against it: But since that (say we) this opinion is condemned legally, it were flat Heresie in any other that should hold it. Of this second *Species* of Heresie, I will intreat in my third Chapter: In this, only of the former: which is; Whether the errors of the *Huguenots* be in themselves so enormous, that they destroy the very foundation of Faith, and by consequence keepe them off, from being of the same Religion with vs.

The first Reason. Pag. 20.

Let vs see then, how our *Antagonist* takes vpon him to proue the contrary. In the first place (saith he) both parties, as well the *Catholikes* as their *Aduersaries*, repute one another for *Heretikes*. I answer, that I finde no impossibilitie, why they may not be both deceiued. For two brothers being in choler, may well renounce one another; and yet they leaue not for all that to continue true brothers alwaies. *Cyrrill* and *Theodoret* accused one another for *Heretiques*, and yet neither of them was so. So that this reason is only drawne from the passion of men, when Reason hath abandoned them.

Pag. 21.

But how doth he proue, that the *Catholikes* repute the *Huguenots* for *Heretikes*. The *Catholike Church* (saith he) hath by
the

the Councell of Trent, condemned diuers of the Lutheran opinions. I answer (according to my first distinction) that it is one thing to returne an opinion for an heresie by condemnation; and another thing to repute it so, of its owne nature. Now whether or no the *Huguenots* be hereticks by condemnation, we will argue it hereafter in our third, fourth, and fifth Chapters. But here we dispute only of the nature of their errour; wherein his proofes are nothing to his purpose. But (saith he) *At Rome euerie holy Thursday the Pope pronounces them* Pag. 21. *excommunicate, and prohibits all Catholikes to reade their Bookes.* In like manner, the same day also he excommunicats all sinners; of whom hee dares not denie but that many are of the Church; else should he himselfe be condemned for an hereticke by the Councell of *Constance*, which gaue sentence against *John Hus*: That the Church consists as well of the bad, as of the good. And whereas the *Huguenots* Bookes be prohibited, so are also the Bookes of *Machiavel*, *Arctine*, and diuers other *Catholikes*.

Let vs next see the opinion which the *Huguenots* haue of the Catholike Doctrine. *Caluine* (saith he) writes that the Pag. 21. *principall points of Doctrine in the Church of Rome, are almost utterly abolished, and the right vse of the Sacraments in many fashions corrupted.* He needs but little explication; the words themselves answer him. *Caluin* saies not, that the Sacraments are vtterly taken away, but the right vse of them, many waies corrupted: Nor, that the principall points of Religion are vtterly destroyed, but almost abolished. A man may be almost kild, and yet liue.

Secondly, to proue how their Religion differs from ours, The second he produces the controuersies of Originall sinne, Free-will, Reason. Iustification, Merits, and diuers others which he iudges of most consequence. It is the greatest pittie in the world to heare how the most of the Preachers in both Religions commonly fight with their owne shadowes, not vnderstanding what it is that their aduersarie holds; which comes only of the subtileries of words inuented by the Deuill to disturbe the Peace of the Church. One partie vnderstanding the word

*Lindanus in pre-
fat. in Lib. de
querela pacis.*

Iustification in one sense, and another in another ; one, Faith one way, and another in another ; one, Grace in one fashion, another after another, and so of the rest : that which we say being true, in our acception of the word, and that which they say being likewise true, as they take it. So, that if the desire of contention were once taken away, we should soone finde, that the most of these disputes wherewith peoples eares are filled, are onely the subtilties of the Schoole, vpon the Etimologies and Definitions of words only. Whence it came to passe, that in the conference at *Regenspurg*, the *Catholikes* and the *Protestants* fell to some agreement in the question of Originall sinne, of Predestination, Free-will, and diuers other points, which is also confessed by Bishop *Lindanus* one of the tartest enemies that the *Huguenots* euer had. Neuerthelesse the Authour of this answer is so ill aduised, as to chuse out these questions principally, to shew the differences betweene them and vs.

For mine owne part, I will not take vpon me to reconcile the said questions, neither know I well (to confesse mine owne ignorance freely) whether it be possible to be done or no : only thus much I assure my selfe, that the difference is not so great, as it is iudged to be. Nor will I too exactly search out the point in controuersie, because I well hope some other man may more happily performe it hereafter. Only I will discourse vpon the said questions as they are commonly vnderstood by the best Doctors in each Religion. In which sense I affirme, (for ought that I haue yet seene) that the errors of the *Huguenots* are not so grosse, as that they impeach their being members of the *Catholike* Church. To cleere which point, I will reduce these questions to these foure heads. 1. The Scripture. 2. Iustification. 3. Prayer. 4. The Sacraments.

I
Scripture.
Pag. 23.

Concerning the Scripture, he chargeth the *Huguenots* only with one error, which is, that they reiect the Bookes of *Tobit*, *Indith*, the *Machabees*, and the rest which they call *Apo-cryphall*, notwithstanding that they were approued for *Canonicall* by the Councell of *Trent*.

To which I answer: That the *Huguenots* doe not altogether reiect them, but esteeme of them as of holy writings, and full of pietie, of greater authoritie than any other booke; on-ly they doe not state them in the same ranke with the other bookes, which are found written in the holy tongue. And this it seemes to me, that *Bellarmino* after a sort accords vnto: Tom. 1. Cont. 1.
Lap. 4. for that in his diuision of the Bookes of the Old Testament, he makes two Classes. In the first hee rankes the bookes receiued by the *Huguenots*: And those which be called *Apocryphall*, in the second. But what though the opinion of the *Huguenots* bee in this point condemned by the Councell of *Trent*, yet is the Councell of *Laodicea* cleere on their sides: And so are also *Hierome*, *Origen*, & *Nicholaus Lyra* himselfe, *Cardinall Caietane*, and many other pillars of the *Roman Church*. So that I would faine know, if that this errour of the *Huguenots* be so enormous, as that for this cause they must necessarily be Heretiques; wherefore then did it not as well hinder *Hierome* from being a Saint, and *Cardinall Caietane* from being a *Catholike*.

Now vnder the title of Iustification, I cōprehend al the differences mentioned in the answer, which were determined in Iustification, 2 the sixth Session of the Councell of *Trent*, touching 1. *The Cause*; 2. *The Matter*; 3. *The Instrument*; 4. *And the Effects of our Iustification*. By the Source or principall Cause, I meane, That disposition by which our Nature (as we *Catholikes* vse to say) being both preuented and accompanied by the grace of God, prepares it selfe to Iustification; that is to say, To the operation of the Free-will, which remained in man after his Fall. For the compounding of this difference; mans Free-will. Free-will must be considered in these three estates; Before Pag. 24. the Fall of *Adam*, after the Fall, and in the time of his regeneration, after he was againe restored. Wherein there is contained whatsoeuer is necessary for a Christian to belecue; namely, That man before the Fall of *Adam* had Free-will both to good and euill; And that by his Fall he lost the libertie to doe good: And that by Grace in his Regeneration he againe recovered it. Thus farre the *Catholikes* and the *Hu-*

Huguenots are agreed: The imaginarie controuersie then lies on-ly in the manner how this will is enfranchised or made free. The *Huguenots* auerring, That is the Grace of God, which sets it at libertie by giuing it new powers, whereof it was altogether destitute before. The *Catholikes* likewise auerring, that the grace of God hath set it at libertie, by loosing the chaines wherewith it was before so captiuated, that it could not set a worke the powers that it had. See here then the true difference betweene them in this point, wherein though the *Huguenots* may bee deceiued, yet is their errour nothing so dangerous, as to ouerthrow the foundation of Faith. In the discussing of which point, we are principally to regard two things: The Iustice of God in punishing *Adams* sinne by this captiuitie; and his Mercy againe in freeing vs. Now if the *Huguenots* be in the wrong, their errour is onely in augmenting the Iustice and Mercie of God, by affirming, That the freedome of our wills, is not onely bound, but slaine (as it were.) Death now is a more grieuous punishment, than imprisonment, and it is a greater mercie to giue life to the will, than libertie. But what need the common people breake their braines, about these Metaphors of binding and killing, which they can neuer comprehend? Tis sufficient for them to know, that nothing can be done without Gods good grace, and to say all with Saint *Austen*, *To doe freely, comes from the Nature of man; to doe well, from Grace; but to doe euill, from our corrupt Nature.* Which saying, as it contains the whole doctrine of Free-will, so is it consented vnto, as well by the *Catholikes* as the *Huguenots*.

The second thing which I obserued in Iustification, is the Matter, that is to say; Whether that righteousness, which is infused into vs by Grace, or that of Christ imputed vnto vs by Faith, be it, by vertue whereof we be iustified before God. And this question, though it be all one with that of Iustification, yet our aduersarie, thereby to multiply the number of his controuersies, makes two of them, so desirous hee is of contention. Concerning which point, the *Huguenots* are in no error in the ground and substance of the question; so that though

though they may be thought to differ neuer so much from vs in the circumstances, yet may they for al that be very good *Catholikes*. For example; A tree which hath the Root, Stocke & many Armes of it sound, may be a good tree though some one bough be crazed: But the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots* are agreed vpon the Root of the question, that is to say, That there are two things necessary: That we be first quit, of our Sinnes, and that wee be next indued with Righteousnesse; to put off our old garments, and re-inuest our selues with new.

1. Vpon the first, the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots* are agreed; namely, That we are pardoned of our sinnes, and redeemed from hell, meere by the blood of Iesus Christ.

2. Touching the second, both sides hold alike; That to be admitted entrance into heauen, we haue need of Righteousnesse, and that this Righteousnesse comes from Christ.

Now the Righteousnesse which is of Christ, is either Inherent in him, & reputed ours, or Inherent in vs, & proceeding from him; being by his grace infused into our hearts; which Act the *Huguenots* call Sanctification: Finally, the *Huguenots* confesse as well as the *Catholikes*, that there be indeed both these kindes of Righteousnesse, onely they differ vpon this, whether the Righteousnesse Inherent in Christ and imputed to vs, or that Inherent in vs, and proceeding from him, be it; by vertue whereof wee become iustified in the sight of God. And what is it to vs, whether another man payes our debts for vs, or giues vs money to pay it our selues? So that (in a manner) they both acknowledge the selfe same Root, the same Stocke, and the same Armes of this question, onely they cannot agree vpon the smaller Branches which grow out of these Armes. Nay more; they both acknowledge the same Branches too, but they cannot agree, vpon which of them they should roost. For the *Huguenots* confesse, that whosoever are saued, are also first sanctified; that is to say, That they haue that kinde of Righteousnesse, which the *Catholikes* call Inherent or Secondarie Righteousnesse. But they say, that they dare not build vpon it, but onely vpon that Righteousnesse, which being inherent in

Christ, is by Faith imputed to them. Seeing then, that this Righteousnesse of Christ is by generall consent acknowledged to bee most perfect; though there may perhaps bee thought to be some errour in the *Huguenots* doctrine, yet no danger can come of it. Like as when a man laies hold on a strong bough, he may very well be deceiued in fearing another may be too weake; yet without doubt he cannot fall, so long as he embraces that which cannot breake.

The Coniun-
tion of Faith
& Grace. p. 23.

Next followes the Instrument by which we imbrace this Righteousnesse, and that is Faith; about the nature whereof the *Huguenots* seeme to him, to hold another error; For that, *They deny* (saies he) *that Grace may bee lost, without the losse of Faith.* Which is but a meere cauill of his, vpon the double signification of the word Faith. For, if we affirme, That Faith is nothing else, but to beleue that God is so and so, and that he hath done such and such things, and to be brieve, that all the Christian doctrine is most true; the *Huguenots* will say (with *Saint Iames*) That the deuills also beleue as much, and that the deuills haue Faith, though without Grace. So that the *Huguenots* mistake, is nothing but in the word, for that they reach, That the Faith of that man, which is deuoid of Grace and Charitie, merits not the honourable title of a Iustifying Faith; and that such a Faith as this, is but the Instrument onely by which we are iustified, which is euer accompanied with Grace, and followed by good Workes. We affirme likewise; That a Faith without Charitie, is a Faith without Forme; wherefore, since the Forme is it, which giues the Being to the thing, it must needs follow; That a perfect Faith can haue no Being, without Charitie: which Tenet is consented vnto, both by the *Huguenots* and the *Catholikes* themselues: onely we differ in termes: the *Huguenots* calling Faith without Charity, an Historicall or dead Faith; and we, a Faith without Forme. O my God, what a pittie it is, to behold the simplicitie of our Christian Faith, thus puzzled about these quiddities.

Merit of
Workes.

There remaines now the Effects of our Iustification, Good Workes: By which euē we Catholikes say, That a man is
not

not made Iust, but that being iustified before, he increases in Righteousnesse : That is ; of a Iust man, hee becomes more Iust ; and being regenerate & in the state of Grace, *He may* (as our Aduersarie saies) *fulfill the Law in such a sort, that he may by it truly and properly merit eternall life.* But as for the fulfilling of the Law, seeing the *Huguenots* doe their best to performe it, although they may be thought to erre, in confessing they cannot doe it, yet hath our Sauour himselfe promised free pardon for it, in the Parable of the Sonne, who refused to doe his Fathers will, and yet did it.

To returne then to Merits by Workes, the more accurate sort of *Catholikes* peremptorily deny, that they are at all meritorious, vnlesse they be dyed in the blood of Christ. And I assure my selfe, that not one amongst ten thousand *Catholikes*, vnderstands sufficiently the meaning of this phrase ; *Workes dyed in the blood of Christ* : but simply and without other addition they will say, That they are in good hope to merit heauen by their Workes. So that (we see) there be three seuerall opinions touching this question.

The first is of the vulgar *Catholikes*, who are more in number a thousand times, and who simply affirme ; That they are indeed able to merit eternall life by their Good Workes.

1.

The second is of the *Huguenots* ; who absolutely deny, That Good Workes doe merit at all : only (say they) God out of his pure Grace, for the Loue of his Sonne, grants them a recompence.

2.

The third is the opinion of the Iesuites and the learned *Catholikes*, who deny, that any kinde of Workes doe of themselves merit, but such onely (as I said) as are dyed in the blood of Christ. Which opinion accords much better with the *Huguenots* doctrine, then that of the vulgar *Catholikes* : for a thing dyed, is not altered in substance, as Copper though gilded, yet continues Copper still : the tincture and the gilding making the thing onely fairer to the eye. And so is it with our Workes, which being by nature corrupt, remaine corrupt still, though dyed in the blood of Christ ; howbeit that the tincture and gilding, makes them more pleasing

3.

Serm. 1. de annu-
ciatione Beate
Virginis.

pleasing vnto God, and for the loue which hee beares to Christs blood, to bee rewarded. And if peraduenture they make conscience of vsing the word *Merit*, let vs hearken to *S. Bernard*: *A man cannot* (saith he) *merit eternall life, by any good works whatsoever.* And yet I trow, that *S. Bernard* was in this no *Huguenot*. For I well know, that a Iesuite with some neat distinction, can make him speake like a *Catholike*, whatsoever his meaning was. Let vs then but doe the *Huguenots* the like courtesie, and make the same distinction in the interpretation of their *Tenent*, as we would doe in the explication of *S. Bernards*, and in this point they will proue as good *Catholikes* as *S. Bernard*, or our selues.

4.
Prayer.
Pag. 16.

The fourth point is Prayer: to wit, whether we ought to inuoke the Saints or not. The difference betwixt vs lies in two points: First, whether we ought to direct our prayers vnto them; the second, whether they pray for vs.

For the first this I say; That the *Catholikes* themselves make two extremities: to wit, in the not inuoking them, as the *Huguenots* doe; and in honouring them too much; which is to say, in attributing to them that honour, which is due only vnto God, which the Schoolemen call *Latria*; which whosoever does, they themselves hold him for an Idolater. Now the poore people which vnderstand not the Greeke, nor what *Latria* meanes, nor comprehends any other mediocritie, than to adore right downe, or not to adore at all; goes to it *bona fide*, and with as much deuotion, adore our Lady and the other Saints, as they doe God himselfe; in such fashion, as that very hardly (euen in the iudgement of *Catholikes*) can the *Catholikes* themselves herein auoid Idolatry.

As for the other extremitie, those *Catholikes* that maintaine Inuocation of Saints, teach only thus much: That it is lawfull to inuoke them, and not vnlawfull, nor to inuoke them. So that there can come no great danger of it, in following the *Catholikes* doctrine if true, nor in following the *Huguenots* though erronous. The *Huguenots* say furthermore, that we ought to honour them; which we may very well doe without inuoking them. As a Subiect may well honour his Soueraigne

ueraigne being absent, though he neuer presented any petition to him in all his life.

As for the second point ; to wit, whether they pray for vs or not: I affirme that there be *Huguenots*, that will confesse that they doe ; neither doth *Caluin* himselfe deny it : only he saith, that he troubles not himselfe greatly, to know whether they doe or no. But should any of them denie it ; where is the danger? *Bellarmino* that great Master of Controuersies affirms, *Tom. I. Contr. 6. lib. 3. cap. 15.* That the soules in Heauen, doe pray for the soules in Purgatory, and they in Purgatory, for those on earth. And yet notwithstanding confesseth, that *Dominicus à Soto* denieth the first, and *S. Thomas Aquinas* the second. Wherefore seeing that Purgatory is more beneficiall to the Pope than Paradice, I can perceiue no reason wherefore the *Huguenots* should rather be Heretiques for disagreeing with the *Catholikes* about the Intercession of the Saints in Heauen, than the *Catholikes* are for differing amongst themselues about the Intercession both of the soules, and for the soules in Purgatory.

The last point wherein the *Huguenots* are departed from the Roman faith is, touching the Sacraments ; wherein the number, nature, and particular Sacraments are to be considered of. And they first miscount themselues in the number, reckoning but two, whereas the Councell of *Trent* hath concluded it, that there are seuen. Which obiection of his is but friuolous ; inasmuch as the difference lies more in the words, than in the thing. For taking the word *Sacrament* properly, *S. Austin* saith, that there be but two, that is to say, Baptisme, & the Eucharist. Further, it is an ordinarie phrase amongst vs *Catholikes* to say, That all the Sacraments issued out of our Sauiours side: whereas there issued nothing from thence saue water and blood, which according as *Chrysostome*, *Cyrl*, and other Ancients interpret it, represent the two Sacraments : that is, Baptisme by the water, and the Cup of the Lords Supper, by the blood. To which our *Catholike* Doctors giue no other answer than this : That the two Sacraments haue some kinde of dignity aboue the rest ; which comes to no more than to say, that there be two principall Sacraments, and five more, inferior to those two. Which is all one with the *Huguenots* opinion,

nion, though in diuers termes. They say that there be but two properly; we say that there be but two principally: We againe, that there be fūe more of an inferiour order; they confesse that there may be more, if we meane of Sacraments in the generall signification.

For *Caluin* yeelds, that Order is a Sacrament, but not common to all men, nor will our *Catholike* Doctors say otherwise. Againe, they will confesse with *S. Paul*, that Mariage is also a Sacrament, taking it in that generall signification wherein the Ancients haue translated the Greeke word. Briefely, they will yeeld that there be seuen, but not barely seuen. And in truth there was none of the Ancient Fathers, that euer light vpon this number of seuen. So that though the *Huguenots* cannot so euently iumpe vpon the number, seeing the Primitiue Church could not doe it; wee may perchance condemne them of ignorance in Arithmeticke, but their error in Theologie cannot be so great.

The difference
betwixt our Sa-
craments, and
those of the
old Law.
Pag. 26.

But he may argue, that they are mistaken in the very nature of the Sacraments; because they deny them to be distinguished in force and vertue, from the Sacraments of the old Law, or that they confer grace. I answer: That this is a meere slander; for the *Huguenots* doe distinguish them from the Sacraments of the old Testament; and doe affirme, that they doe also confer grace. What would you desire more of them? But not (saith he) *ex opere operato*. The difference then is not in the matter, whether our Sacraments confer more grace, or are of more efficacie, than those of the old Law, but in the manner only, by what meanes this grace is conferred. As for the manner, we should not me thinks too narrowly prie into it, as *Bel-larmine* very sagely aduiseeth vs. *Like as in Christs miracles* (saith he) *the parties that were healed, needed not to inquire in what manner the garment of Christ did cure them, it being sufficient to them to beleene only, that the touch of it wrought the cure: iust so is it not necessarie* (saith he) *that the Ministers or the Receiners of the Sacraments should be curious to know, in what manner they become the causes of our Iustification.*

Tom. 2. contr. 1.
lib. 2. cap. 1.

The efficacie
of Baptisme.
Pag. 23.

We come next to the particular Sacraments, whereof hee makes mention but of three only: That is to say, Baptisme,
the

the Sacrament of the Altar, and Penance. Touching Baptisme, they affirme, saith he, *That Originall sin sticks so close to man, that neither by Baptisme, nor any other remedie, can it be gotten off.* I answer: That euen the *Huguenots* confesse as freely as the *Catholikes*, that a man is washed from Originall sinne by Baptisme, which is enough for a Christian to beleue in this point: so that the difference lies meerely in the nicity of the word, whether it should rightliest be called Sinne, or no Sinne: The *Catholikes* holding, that the Sinne is so farre remitted, that the concupiscence which remaines, ought not to be called Sinne: The *Huguenots* affirming, that the remaining Concupiscence may very well be called Sinne, although they herein consent to the *Catholikes*, That a man is so clearly absolued and discharged of it, that it is not reputed as a Sinne. For which cause in no other sense doe they deny the grace receiued in Baptisme, though they still esteeme themselues sinners altogether, than the Debtor doth his Creditors mercy; who confessing that he hath receiued the fauour of him, to haue his debts forgiuen, doth neuerthelesse acknowledge himselfe his debtor. Which way soeuer it be taken, the sinner is pardoned, and the debtor discharged, and what need haue we to desire more?

Hee may say perchance againe: That the *Huguenots* erre not so much in acknowledging the benefits receiued in Baptisme, because they are not so well aware of the danger that followes the want of it: For they affirme (saith he) that the children of Christians may be esteemed righteous, and haue admittance into the kingdome of heauen without Baptisme, notwithstanding that Iesus Christ hath said, That whosoever is not borne againe of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen: I answer: that the *Huguenots* affirme not, that euery childe borne of Christian Parents dying without Baptisme is saued, but those only whom God in his eternall counsell hath elected. So that the question is not so much about Baptisme, as about Gods electiō: wherein there can be no danger, to confesse our ignorance, referring still Gods owne decrees to his owne good pleasure, as the *Huguenots* doe. For they instance not in what children are elected, but forbear to presse into Gods cabinet, and out of that to pronounce, that such and such children shall be saued.

And if he replies againe, That the Election of God is neuer destitute of these secundarie meanes, and that Baptisme is the means, by which he saues those that are elected; and that it is a most manifest signe, that those who are deprived of this Baptisme, are also deprived of that election: I answer; That there be *Catholikes*, who teach, that a man may be saued without these secundarie meanes. *S. Damascene*, *S. Brigid*, and some other *Catholikes* doe hold, that the Emperour *Trajan*s soule was deliuered out of Hell by the prayers of *S. Gregory*, notwithstanding that he died a *Painim*, and without Baptisme. If they then be not Heretiques, that teach the mercy of God to be so great, that he saued one who had sinned actually, notwithstanding that he died without Faith, and without Baptisme; why should it be accounted Heresie, to say, that he sometimes saues little Innocents, who neuer had more than Originall Sin? For it is a more extraordinary thing, to draw one out of Hell, than to keepe one from going thither. And what fauour God had shewen to one, he may likewise shew to many.

As for that text of *S. Iohn*, *Regenerate of water and of the Holy Ghost*, it is to shew; that the ordinary meanes vnto saluation, is to conioyne the outward signe, to the inward grace, according to *S. Pauls* saying, *That with the heart man belieues vnto righteousness, & with the tongue he confesses to saluation*; which shewes thus much; that ordinarily the outward cōfessiō goes with the inward affection: nor can it be inferred out of the former text, That faith can neuer be without the cōfessiō of the mouth, no more than it can by the other, that Grace cannot be without the washing of the body.

The Baptisme
of Iohn.

Finding now no great matter in the *Huguenots* Doctrine blameworthy about the Baptisme of Christ; he descends to the Baptisme of *Iohn*: which in the *Huguenots* opinion differs not at all from that of Christ. To which I answer; That all the *Huguenots* hold not this opinion: Secondly, that this difference is of no such great importance, because that they that hold it, doe it not to derogate from the Baptisme of Christ; for that they esteeme it not *Iohns* Baptisme, but Christs, administred by *Iohn*, before Christs declaring of himselfe, as it was by the Apostles afterwards. Finally, all this dispute is not about Christs Baptisme which the people receiue, but about *Iohns*, which they receiue not; and consequently it matters not much, to vnderstand the force & efficacie of it.

In

In the next place followes the Sacrament of the Altar, which comprehends two differences propounded in the answer. Which be, Christs presence in it; and the Sacrifice of the Masse. Vpon the first the *Huguenots* are accorded with the *Catholikes* in the thing it selfe; that is, That our Sauour is truly present in the holy Sacrament, and that we doe eat his body, and drinke his blood. The difference only lies in the manner, how he is present, & how we eat and drinke him. Which errorr cannot touch the foundation of Faith, for as much as, according to our *Catholike* Doctors opinion, it was left free for euerie man, by the space of 1000 yeeres after Christs death, to beleue this presence of his, in what manner they thought best, prouided that they beleue it at all. Whence it is manifest, that it is but the *Huguenots* ill luck to liue in such a rigorous age of the Church, otherwise they should not for this haue beene heretickes. For diuers of the ancient Fathers were infected with this errorr. *Theodoret*, yea and *Gelasius* too, who was also Pope, haue written in expresse words, That euen after the Consecration of these holy Mysteries, the very nature and substance of the bread remained still. True it is that the *Huguenots* may well be shent for reuiuing of this errorr, when they see that the Church of *Rome*, and which is more, the Pope himselfe hath condemned it; neuerthelesse seeing that *Gelasius*, who was likewise a Pope, held the verie same error; we *Catholikes* should doe well to qualifie it all we can, for the reputation of the *Sea Apostolique*.

Transubstanti-
ation.
Pag. 26.

*Theod. Dialog.
Gelasius lib. de
duabus naturis.*

Now for the Sacrifice of the Masse, they both confesse with *St. Paul*, that there is but one Sacrifice for sinne, namely, that one of *Iesus Christ* vpon the Crosse; in such sort, that the *Catholikes* as- firme not, that they make any new Oblation, but only represent that former one, so oftentimes ouer, as they celebrate the *Eucharist*, in which Christ is continually offered vp. But for as much as *St. Paul* teaches, That there is not only but one Sacrifice, but also that *Iesus Christ* is but once offered: this Doctrine of ours had neede be verie subtilly interpreted, which no man in my iudgement could finelie doe then *St. Thomas Aquinas*, who saith, That this Sacrament is named an Immolation of Christ, in two regards, the first, for that (as *St. Austin* saith) Signes are called by the names of the things whereof they be Signes: the second, for that by vertue

The Sacrifice
of the Masse.
Pag. 26.

*Thom. 2. part.
quest. 83. Artic. 1.*

Aug. ad Bonifa-
cium, epist. 23.

of this Sacrament, we are made partakers of the death of Iesus Christ. Well, let vs see then how far the *Huguenots* accord with *S^t. Thomas* in these two manners of the offering vp of Christ Iesus. For the first, seeing that it is collected out of *St. Austen*, let vs heare him in his owne words. *He falsifies not (saith he) who saies that Iesus Christ is offered vp euerie day, for if the Sacraments had not a kind of resemblance of the things whereof they be Sacraments, they could not be Sacraments at all; and by reason of this resemblance, they ordinarily take the names of the things themselves.* According to which interpretation the *Huguenots* will also say, that Christ is offered vp in the Sacrament, for as much as the Sacraments haue the name of the things which they signifie. And seeing that the Eucharist signifies the death of Christ, a man may well giue the same tearme to the Eucharist, which he does to his death. And for as much as he was offered vp by his death, the *Huguenots* will confesse likewise, that he is also offered vp in the Eucharist, by reason (as *St. Austen* saith) of this resemblance betweene them.

Concerning the second respect, for which *S. Thomas* saies, that the Eucharist is called the *Immolation* of Iesus Christ, that is, for that in the Sacrament we are made partakers of the death of Iesus Christ; the *Huguenots* will also agree therunto. For it is their common phrase of speech to say, that in this Supper they are made partakers of the death and passion of Iesus Christ. Now if there be any third way of offering, questionlesse it is no matter of any great importance; for that *S. Thomas* was so good a Catholike, and so subtile a Logician, and aboue all, so experienced in the distinctions and other stratagems of the Schoole, would neuer haue made mention barely of two manners of offerings, had there been any third of any consequence.

Penance.
Pag 26.

The last Sacrament which he instances in, is *Penance*, wherein the Author of the answer obserues no difference, but onely names it in that fashion, that I cannot see what fault hee findes in the *Huguenots* doctrine. But to picke out his meaning, I trow, that the difference lies principally in two points: That is to say, Whether this *Penance* be well called a Sacrament, or not; and secondly, What be the parts of it. For the first point, of the title of Sacrament; It is but a wrangling about the word, as I haue shewed before, when I discoursed of the number of the Sacraments. As for the

the parts; Namely, *Contrition*, *Confession*, and *Satisfaction*, if that he blames the *Huguenots* for not holding them properly parts thereof; I answer him, That neither doe all Catholikes hold them so: For *Durandus* makes but two parts, *Confession* and *Absolution*, and *Scotus* saies, that there is but one, which is *Absolution*.

But if the question be whether these three things be requisite or not, the *Huguenots* will also say that they are; to wit, that it is necessary for a Penitent to haue *Contrition* and sorrow of heart, to confesse and acknowledge our sins vnto God, nay, and that it is profitable also to confesse them to the Pastors of the Church, but not so absolutely necessarie: because (according to the iudgment of the learned *Catholikes*) this Auricular Confession was neuer instituted by God, nor yet of a long time practised in the Church; as *Beatus Rhenanus*, who was himselfe a Catholike, hath very well obserued.

*In Annat. ad
lib. Tertull. de pœ-
nitent. a.*

Finally, as for *Satisfaction*, it is to be considered either in this life, or in the life to come in Purgatory. That in this life, the *Huguenots* approue of, and teach it to bee most necessary to Saluation, to giue satisfaction to men whom we haue any way offended, and in regard of our sins against God, to walke in newnesse of life. Moreouer, they confesse that God punisheth men in this life by temporall afflictions, yea, euen those whose sins are pardoned.

Tis true indeed, that they deny any satisfaction or punishment to be in Purgatory after death for sinne: but herein their error cannot be great; first because *S. Austen* puts it down no otherwise than as a thing probable and not necessary, saying no more, but, *It may be that it is true*. And secondly, because that neither can the *Catholikes* agree vpon it amongst themselves; some of them placing Purgatory here vpon earth, others vnder it; some neither aboue, nor below, but in the Aire. Some affirme, that all the Elect shall goe thither, yea the Apostles and Martyrs themselves: others thrust in those only, who haue not in this life giuen full satisfaction for their sins. And for the fire, some would haue it a Materiall fire; some, fire and water; others, neither of both. Lastly, some there be that teach, that the soules are there tormented by Devils; others, by Angels, others by neither of both. How then I pray is this question likely to be so necessary, about w^{ch} there is so much vncertainty, that

*Purgatorie.
Pag 26.*

*Lib. 21. de Civ.
Dei, ap. 26.*

that we neither know (as I haue shewed), who they be that goe thither, nor where it is, nor by whom they are to be tormented, nor what they are to suffer. The difference then betwixt the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots*, is but this; That the *Huguenots* beleue it not at all, and the *Catholikes* know not what they beleue.

See here in briefe the *Huguenots* opinions vpon the points before mentioned, by which we may perceiue their errours not to be in the substance of Faith, and doe not therefore hinder them from being of the Church and *Catholike* Religion. For euery error in Theologie doth not separate a man from the Church. *S. Cyprian* was an Anabaptist in the point of Rebaptization, and yet was he a Martyr. *S. Hierome* (as I said before) held those bookes of Scripture for Apocryphall, which the Councell of *Trent* hath since concluded to be Canonically, and yet remaines hee still Canonized for a Saint. *Tertullian* one of the ancient Fathers fell to be a Montanist: And *Origen* alone held as many errours, as all the *Huguenots* together; yet was he one of the most famous Doctors of the whole Church. And to come neerer to our times; In how many questions of Diuinitie did *Scotus* and *Thomas Aquinas* differ, the two prime pillars of Schoole-Diuinitie? *Melchior Canus* and *Bellarmino* accuse *Caietane* of diuers errors, who for all that remaines one of the venerable Colledge of Cardinals. The *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* could neuer yet agree about our Ladies conception, yet be both of them held for very good *Catholikes*. So that, as I said, the *Huguenots* may very safely be accounted good *Catholikes*, so long as they hold the foundation of Diuinitie, although they put some few tyles out of order on the roofof the house, and build with hay and straw: vpon condition still, that (as *S. Paul* saith) it be vpon the same foundation. Otherwise we must conclude, the Martyrs, the Saints, the ancient Fathers, the Doctors of the Church, the prime Schoolemen, the Cardinals, yea and the *Catholikes* themselves, to be no *Catholikes*.

CAP. 2.

The Catholikes as well as the Huguenots doe not agree with the ancient Church in matter of Ceremonies : and that therefore the Huguenots are not to be condemned.



AS in men we consider their bodies, and their apparell; so in the Church likewise we consider the Doctrine, and the Ceremonies. As for the doctrine or body of Religion, I have shewn in the former Chapter that the Huguenots haue the braine, the heart, and the liuer, and all other the vitall parts, whole and sound : that is, that they yet hold all the principall points of faith, and that the maine thing that can seeme to be blamed in them, is, that they haue some certaine warts or spots in their skinne; certaine errors I meane, in the circumstances and application of that faith. Now for the apparell and ceremony of Religion, I confesse that the Church of the Huguenots is not so gorgeously or richly set out as the Church of Rome, and is for the same cause not so well entertained, and more despised in the Courts of great Princes and Monarches of the world : which I iudge to be the reason why the Catholike Apology endeouored to excuse the simple and naked Ceremonies of the Reformed Church, without any intent thereby to disparage the gorgeous and gay attire of the Catholike Church; but to shew onely; That wee should not so meanly esteeme this outward simplicity, as to condemne it without hearing. Euen as that officer would bee held too rigide and seuer, that would hinder a poore man from presenting his Petition to the Prince, because hee is not clad like a Courtier.

The reason for which the Apology doth excuse them, is, for that the ancient Church did sometimes heretofore content her selfe with the like simplicity. Now vpon this occasion the Author of the answer perswades himselfe that he hath got-

ten a great advantage vpon the Catholike Apology : Because (saith he) he can proue, that diuers of these ceremonies which the Huguenots doe reiect are very ancient : To which I answer, That I willingly accept as much as hee grants, that is, that he cannot proue that *all* the ceremonies of the Church of Rome be most ancient, but onely (as he saith) *diuers* of them. As for those diuers which hee instanceth in, that you may see how impertinent they are, I will make it appeare in these two things : First, that he doth not proue against the Huguenots that the Church of Rome doth agree with the ancient Church in the selfe same ceremonies. Secondly, that admitting that the ancient Church had them in vse, yet are not the Huguenots to be condemned for hauing disused them.

That the Church of Rome agrees not with the Primitiue Church in matter of ceremonies.

For the first point : my purpose is not to condemne the ceremonies of our Mother the holy Church, but since that our side are so strait laced, as to hinder our reconciliation for a thing so indifferent as these ceremonies are ; I haue taken the boldnesse to oppose them: and to shew, That the Huguenots may easily answer the argument which hee alleages : which I write not to iustifie them, but with a purpose that we should not so confidently assure our selues, that all is so cleare on our sides. Let vs heare then how the Huguenots may answer the 15 examples which he bringeth.

I
Signe of the Crosse.
Pag. 27.

The first example is the *signe of the Crosse* : concerning which, the Huguenots will confesse that it hath beene anciently vsed ; but that the vse of this was brought into the Church, vpon a particular occasion, and proper onely to that age. For the Pagans amongst whom the Christians in those dayes conuerfed, were wont when they met with a Christian to make the signe of the crosse in derision of their Christianity, for that the God whom they worshipped was hanged vpon a crosse ; so that the Christians, to shew that they were not ashamed of such a death, in al their actions would stil make the sign of the crosse. But now this occasiō being taken away, the Huguenots may likewise say, that it is not necessary to continue the practice no more then it is to apply a plaister to a wound already healed.

As for *praying to the East* : I neuer yet knew any Huguenot that

that held it vnlawfull to pray towards the East, nor any Catholike that thought it vnlawfull to pray also towards other quarters of the world. What more then is there to be said betweene them, but onely that it is an indifferent custome, which hath not beene alwayes so strictly obserued in all Churches. For *Socrates* saith that in the Church of Antioch, the high Altar was placed cleane contrary, and towards the West.

2
Praying towards the East.
Pag. 28.

As for the *inuocation of the Eucharist*, our aduersary affirms, that it appeareth by *Saint Basile*, That this inuocation was then and from the Apostles time practised, when they shewed the Eucharist. I answer; that these words make nothing against the Huguenots, for a man may very well vse inuocation in the time of the celebration of the Sacrament, and all the while direct his inuocation to God, and not to the Sacrament. True it is, that there was a speciall Prayer appointed for that purpose, which *Saint Basile* thought to haue beene a tradition of the Apostles: But now the Catholikes themselves doe not any longer obserue that forme of prayer: and it cannot be found in any antiquity, what forme of prayer that was, which *Saint Basile* speakes of. So that if this prayer were an Apostolicall tradition, our Church hath had small care in preserving it; which made me beleue that we haue some things put vpon vs vnder the title of Apostolicall tradition, which are not so. For it is still as easie to inuent some new tradition, which wee haue not yet received, as to forget those which we haue already entertained. For God ordinarily where he takes away the memory, supplies that defect with inuention and sufficiency of iudgement. It being very wisely done, when we haue lost one tradition, to put another in the place, thereby to keepe the number full still, and entire.

3
Inuocation of the Eucharist.

The fourth example is of *Hallowing the water in Baptisme*. Now the Huguenots will confesse with *Saint Basile*, that the water of Baptisme ought to bee blessed: But this they deny; that this hallowing was such heretofore, as that now in vse with vs. For as much as they say, That water and all other creatures are sanctified by God already: and particularly that the water of Baptisme needs no benediction to make it more

4
Blessing of the water in Baptisme.
Pag. 28.

Homil. 25. 172
Job. 77.

holy ; because (as saith Saint *Chrysostome*) Christ by his Baptisme hath blessed all waters. But if my Antagonist will proceed further to inferre, that the water in Baptisme ought of necessity to be hallowed in the same sort that it is now ; I say that *Eusebius* writes that *Constantine* the Great would haue men to baptise in Iordan ; and yet I neuer heard that all the water of Iordan was made holy water.

5.6.
Consecration
and vse of Oyle
in Baptisme.
Pag. 28.
*Tertull lib. de
corona militis.*

They will say as much of the consecration of the Oyle : the word consecration at the first, signifying no more then the institution of a signe to an holy vse. And as for the vse of oyle, like as the ancient Church made vse of it in Baptisme, so did they also of milke and honey ; neither of which are any more in vse, no not in the Romane Church. Why then should the Huguenots be blamed more for the want of one ceremony, then the Catholikes would be for want of another ? And this also serues to disproue that other example which followes, to wit, that the Romane Church agreeth with the ancient in all the ceremonies of Baptisme.

7
Lent.
Epiphanius heresi.
75.

*Hieronymus contra
Lu. 15.*

His next example is of the Fast in *Lent*, which Saint *Hierome* esteemes for an Apostolicall tradition. To which the Huguenots will answer, that *Epiphanius* saith, that it is an Apostolicall tradition also to fast vpon Wednesdaies and Frydaies, except vpon those betwixt Easter and Whitsontide : in which time the said S. *Hierome* in the very book quoted by the Answerer, saith that it is vnlawfull to fast : & yet do the Catholikes fast notwithstanding vpon Fridaies in that very time. Why then are the Huguenots more to be blamed for disusing the custome of the ancient Church in the obseruation of the forty dayes before Easter, then the Catholikes, for dissenting from the same Church, in the obseruation of the 50. dayes after ?

8
Sacrifice for the
dead.

Concerning the sacrifice for the dead, it appeares by that Liturgy of the Greekes, which is read in the fift Tome of Saint *Chrysostomes* workes, that they made mention amongst the dead (for whom they made their oblations) of the Apostles and Marytrs ; who according to the iudgement of all parties, doe goe directly into heauen, and haue no need of any such oblation as men offer at this day, for the easing of the soules departed.

departed. So as the Huguenots will say, that it must needs follow that the soules of the Saints which are in Paradise are holpen by such oblations, (which none of the wiser Catholikes will maintaine) or else that the sayd sacrifice for the dead was no other thing then a *Commemoration* made in the time of the Celebration of the Eucharist; and thus much the wiser sort of Huguenots will not find fault withall.

The next example is of the *Baptisme of Infants*: which the Huguenots allow of as well as the Catholikes.

9
Baptisme of infants.

As for the mixing of water with the wine in the Chalice, this in the iudgement of the better learned Catholikes, is not a thing so necessarily required. And why then should we blame the Huguenots for omitting this ceremony? In like manner the better learned amongst the Hugenots will confesse that it is lawfull: and why then should they blame the Catholikes for obseruing it? That which is not necessary may lawfully be omitted, and that obserued which is lawfull.

10
Mixture of water with the wine in the Chalice.

Another example is of *perpetuall single life*, which the Huguenots blame not: but they will say that the obseruation of it in those times was voluntary, and not constrained; and that men were neuer compelled to vow it, as appears by the very Canons themselves. *The Church* (saith one Canon) *after the constitution of the Apostles, added some counsell of perfection, as this of the single life of Priests*: where we may obserue 2. things against the answer; one is, that single life was ordained by way of counsell, not of commandement: the other, that it was ordained since the Apostles times, & could therefore be no tradition of the Apostles.

11
Perpetuall single life.

The next example is of the *solitary* or *contemplative life*; which the Huguenots will not absolutely condemne: but they may well say that it hath beene in times past, much different from this of our Hermites and Anchorites at this day. For they which first brought in this manner of liuing, obserued it onely in the time of persecution, to auoid idolatry, and all other occasions of being enforced to vnlawfull actions by the tyrants which then ruled: as the Ecclesiasticall stories do testifie in the liues of S. *Paul* and S. *Anthony*, the two first Hermits.

12
Solitary life.

Sozomen. Histor. lib. 1. cap. 12.

13
Orders of Monkes.

Now for the *order of Monkes*: the Huguenots will name

Athanasius ad
Dracontium.

14
Election of
Meates.

Tripartite 9. 38.

15
Holy-daies.
Lib. 5. cap. 21.

the very yeare when each of them was inuented. And what though the name of Monks was vsuall in the primitiue Church yet were they then other manner of Monkes, then ours at this day. For first, they earned their liuings by the sweat of their browes. Secondly, diuers of them were married, as *Athanasius* writes. Finally, the Huguenots will say, that there was neuer Monke in the Primitiue Church that killed a King; nor any Catholike in those times, that would haue approued it.

There remaines the *election of meats*; which the Huguenots approue, so that it be done with discretion, and not meerly for conscience, according to the custome of the ancient Church. For the better clearing of this point, we may (me thinks) distinguish betweene the difference of meats, and the choyce of meats. For the Huguenots will say, that there is no difference of meats in respect of Religion; for that it is lawfull to eat indifferently of all sorts of meats, without making scruple of Conscience; but that men for the raming of their flesh may abtaine from such meats, as they finde to prouoke them to concupiscence: which kinde of abstinence because it is left free, to the choise of him that fasteth, may properly be called *Election of meats*. For the Apostles (saith the Ecclesiasticall Story) haue left it to euery mans libertie, to vse as well in their fasts, as on other dayes, such kinds of meates as they best like of. Whereas the Fastes enioyned by the Church of Rome, may rather (will the Huguenots say) be called *A Prescription of meats*, then a free *Election*: Because Election is still voluntary, and their abstinence is constrained.

Finally, concerning *Holy-daies*, which they call an Apostolicall tradition, I say, that the Ecclesiasticall Stories shew the cleane contrary; For *Socrates* saith in expresse words, *That the Apostles ordained nothing concerning Holy-daies*. Again, they which supposed them to haue beene ordained by the Apostles, are enforced at length, to place the obseruation of them in the Classe of things indifferent. For of all the Festiuall daies, there was not one of them which hath beene obserued with more deuotion then Easterday; which notwithstanding, the Westerne Church vsed to celebrate vpon Sunday, and the Easterne,

Easterne, vpon other daies : the one confirming their custome by the tradition of *S. Peter and Paul*, and the other by the tradition of *Philip and Iohn*. Which controuersie, was thus taken vp betwixt *Polycarpus*, and *Victor* Bishop of Rome; namely, that the obseruation of it should be left free and indifferent. Now the Huguenots doe not simply condemne the obseruation of Holy-daies, but only the forcing to the obseruation of them. For in England, Germany, Switzerland, and other Countries, where the pretended Reformed Religion is established, they to this day obserue diuers Saints daies, without reprehension of the Huguenots in France.

But put the case, that the vse of all the foresaid Ceremonies were such in the ancient Church, as they now are in the Romane; yet say I, that all these examples make nothing to the purpose; For asinuch as Ceremonies (as I haue said) are but the apparell, which alters the fashion euery foot, and are fitted to time and place: which our Aduersary himselfe confesseth. For, knowing that the most part of our Ceremonies were vnknowne to the Ancients, he hath no other Answer then this, which will also serue to answer him againe, viz: That it matters not much, whether the Ecclesiasticall Ceremonies were in vse in the Primitiue Church, or were newly taken vp in these latter times. Now the Scriptures (will the Huguenots say) denounces the same curse against those which adde, as against those which take away: so that if it be lawfull for the Romane Church to adde any thing to the ancient Ceremonies, it is as lawfull for them also to take away, especially those which haue beene added.

That the Huguenots are not to be blamed for leauing off the Ceremonies of the ancient Church.

Secondly, the Church is called Primitiue, either in regard of it selfe, because it is truly ancient; or in respect of the moderne Church of Rome, as it is more ancient in its selfe. If we speake now of the Church, as it is ancient in it selfe; the Huguenots will say, that there is no resemblance betwixt the Ceremonies of the ancient Church and those of the moderne. But if we speake of that which is more ancient then ours, (from which only our Aduersaries Arguments are drawne) they will say, that (besides all this, that the most part of our Cere-

Epist. 119. 19.

Ceremonies are different) yet at that time also were there too many in the Church; in so much as Saint *Augustine* in his time complained exceedingly of the multitude of them.

Finally, as the ancient Church had some Ceremonies which the Huguenots haue not; so had it likewise others, which the Church of Rome hath not; as Milke and Honey in Baptisme, and the fashion of plunging the Infant thrice to the bottome: which haue beene abrogated (as Saint *Thomas* saith) to auoid the calumnies of the Sabellians, who for this custome reproched the Christians, that they worshipped three Gods. From whence we may collect, how indifferent things these Ceremonies are, so long as they are not abused: and on the other side how lawfull it is, yea, and how necessary, to take away the vse of them, for preuenting of an inconuenience. So that we may say thus much in the Huguenots behalfe; that they doe, not in this point, swarue so much from the practice of the ancient Church, seeing they doe not condemne those diuers Ceremonies which were practised anciently; notwithstanding, that they doe now forbear them, especially when they haue obserued them to change into so much superstition, as that our better learned Catholikes, doe euen laugh at the poore people, whom they themselues haue abused.

CAP. 3.

That the doctrine of the Huguenots hath not beene condemned by any lawfull Iudgement, before the Councell of Trent.

Hitherto haue I spoken of the Huguenots Religion as it is in it selfe, As well in Doctrine, as in Ceremonies, viz: That Ceremonies be things indifferent; And as for their errors in doctrine, that they be not in the foundation of faith. So that they, not being Heretikes in respect of the wickednesse of their opinions; let vs now trauesse the Indifferent, to finde whether they be so by condemnation. Now our Aduersarie to conuict them, produces the Decrees of diuers

Andradus de-
fent. fidei 11-
dent. Lib. 4.

Co-cil. Trid.
Sess. 3.

Controuerfies at Doway, and one of the moft learned Catholikes of our times, who hath written moft accurately of this Argument holds, That the holy Ghost is onely promifed to affift the Councells in neceffary things, and that in other things they may erre. And *Andradus* himfelfe, who defends the Councell of *Trent*, in the very fame Booke wherein hee does defend it as generall, lawfull, and found in the matter of Faith, condemnes the vulgar tranflation of the Bible, as corrupted, although the faid Councell had authorized it for authentickall; fo little did hee truft to the iudgement of Councells in things which were befide the effence of faith.

3. *Conf.*

But admitting thus much; That a lawfull Councell cannot erre at all, yet is there ftill a third difficulty; *viz.* Whether thefe Councells which hee produceth againft the *Huguenots* bee lawfull: which euen a Catholike may fafely deny; for as much as there bee diuers nullities to bee found in them, and namely in their manner of proceeding, which are no where found in the ancient Councells, as I will fhew in the next Chapter, when I treat of the Councell of *Trent*. Now, the *Huguenots* will bee very well content to bee tryed by the Ancient Councells, held in the firft 600 yeares of Chrift; namely, vntill fuch time as the Pope (as they fay) hauing gotten fo abfolute a Monarchie in the Church, tooke away the liberty of Councells, and fubiefted the fuffrages of the other Bifhops to giue with him: now all the Councells alleadged by our Aduerfaries are fince that time.

4. *Conf.*

There remaines a fourth difficulty, namely, Whether the *Huguenots* haue beene iuftly condemned by the latter Councells. Now vpon thefe foure confiderations, a man may perceiue how frivolous his brags are of the Councells; for as much as he is able to conclude nothing, vnleffe he hath leaue granted him before hand to adde what authority to the Councells he pleafeth; to make what Councells lawfull hee lifte, and to force the Councells to fpeake what hee would haue them: The moft innocent man in the world might bee conuicted by fuch proofes, if a man would beleue without further examination, whatfoeuer euery witnefs fhall bring againft him:
and

and when his Aduersary also shall haue leaue, both to packe the witneses at his owne pleasure, and also to iudge of their testimonies.

But to returne to our purpose. Let vs see next, whether the Huguenots stand lawfully condemned by those Councells which hee produceth, or not. The Catholike Apologie denies it; whereby (in my conceit) hee shewes a great deale of zeale to the *Romane* Religion. For, considering what a world of people are infected with the *Huguenots* doctrine, by reason that it is not yet condemned by any lawfull forme of proceeding; he endeuors to perswade with the Catholikes, to cause a lawfull Councell to bee called to confute them, to the end, that the *Huguenots* might bee satisfied by being shewed their errors, and bee left without excuse for reiecting the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. But obseruing that there bee many seditious Catholikes (who rather thirst to kill their bodies, then to saue their soules) doe hinder so holy a designe, vnder colour, that they bee already condemned by other Councells: The Catholike Apology doth very well herein, to aduise them not to desist for all this, but to pursue so good an enterprize; for as much as the former Decrees, by which the *Huguenots* stand condemned: are not of such authority, but that they may appeale from them to an higher power. So that wee must sue out another Procelse against them, to get such a Iudgment as they themselues shall neuer bee able to except against. Now our Aduersary answers, that there is no neede to take this course, affirming that they bee indeed cast already by such a Iudgment; which hee proues by two reasons. One is, that the doctrine of the *Romane* Church hath beene publicly confirmed by generall Councells, before that of *Trent*. The second is, that the *Huguenots* religion is the same with that of ancient Heretikes, which hath beene heretofore condemned.

For the first, The chiefe Controuerfie is (saith hee) about Transubstanti-
the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; which is not onely de-
termined by the Councell of *Trent*, but also by tenne most an-
cient councils of the Church. To make good which assertion,

he cites the Councell of *Vercelles*, *Tours*, *Tienna*, *Constance*, *Florence*: and of five others, celebrated at *Rome*; the chiefe of which was that of *Lateran*, vnder *Innocent* the third. And these be the tenne Councells which our Aduersary styles the most ancient Councells of the Church. Certainly, then was the Church a long time without Councells, for the ancientest of these was 1000 yeares after the Apostles times. But peradventure he meanes it onely of the Church of *Rome*, as it is different in doctrine from the ancient Church; which is as much to say, As these Councells are the most ancient of this (*Romane*) Church, which not long before the celebrating of these Councells, became a new Church, and quite contrary to the former. And in this sense, hee doth not account these Councells as simply ancient, but the most ancient onely of that Church which is not ancient. I can but wonder how he comes so ill aduised, as to giue this aduantage to the *Huguenots*, as to conclude vpon him out of his owne premises; *That our holy mother Church of Rome, is a new Church*: and so giue a hint to the vulgar to discover by his owne confession, that it is so indeed. Which inconuenience, the Author of the *Catholike Apologie* was better aware off to prevent it, for knowing very well, that we are not able to make good the doctrine of the *Romane Church* by the ancient Councells, he aduiseeth rather that wee should labour the calling of a new one; lest that by vrging the other, which indeed bee not ancient, the common people might come by this meanes to suspect that our doctrine is new.

But to returne to the said Councells: besides this, that they are all new, there be also seuen of the tenne which were neuer receiued for generall, by the most learned defenders of the *Romane religion*; and by the opinion therefore of those very *Catholikes*, they may erre, and by consequence it will bee lawfull to appeale from them to a generall Councell. Iust as the opinion of *S. Cyprian* about *Rebaptization*, being condemned at *Rome* in a particular Councell, by Pope *Cornelius*, and the sentence ratified by Pope *Stephan*; yet did *S. Cyprian* neuerthelesse continue in his former opinion, accusing both
the

the Popes and the Councils of error; which certainly hee would not haue done, had hee esteemed the authority of a particular Councell, without appeale: whereby it appeares, that of those tenne Councils which hee vrgeth, there be but three, namely, that of *Lateran*, of *Vienna*, and of *Florence*, which be esteemed generall, euen by the Catholikes themselves: and so by consequence onely three, which haue power definitiuely to determine, and not to bee subiect to an appeale to bee made from them.

As for the Decree of that Councell of *Lateran*, wee ought not to thinke it strange, that the *Huguenots* except against it, seeing that the said Councell, in the iudgement euen of the Catholikes themselves might erre, in the sentence giuen against them; for *Scotus* saith of *Transubstantiation*, That it is but an opinion probable; now, an opinion probable is not necessary; and in determining vpon a doctrine which is not necessary, *Stapleton* saith: That a generall Councell may erre: whereby it appeares, that in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, the Decree of the Councell aforesaid was not certaine. Can wee imagine then that the *Huguenots* will stand to such a Decree, which the Catholikes themselves confesse to bee subiect to error.

As for the Councell of *Vienna*, this error (saith hee) is condemned in it, which is: *That wee ought not to doe any honour or reuerence to the holy Eucharist*; which, as euery man knowes is the error of *Caluin*, and of all the *Sacramentaries*. I answer: That our Aduersary, and such as hee, doe much iniury the church of *Rome*, in giuing the *Huguenots* occasion to reproach the Catholikes, as to twit them, that they bee lyers and slanderers. For they of the Religion doe not affirme (as hee would make them) that wee ought not to giue any honour or reuerence to the *Eucharist*: but that wee should not adore it as the Catholikes doe.

The last Councell is that of *Florence*; the authority whereof, the *Huguenots* may well except against, for that it dissenteth from other Councils. For the Councils of *Basil* and *Constance*, both which our Aduersary rankes here amongst the generall

nerall Councils, haue adiudged it, *That the authoritie of a Councell is aboue the Pope*; whereas the Councell of *Florence*, makes the Pope aboue the Councell. Which sentence is not only (as I thinke) contrary to the Councell of *Basil* and *Constance*, but contradictory also to the iudgement of all the Diuines in Paris at that time. So that if the Huguenots doe ill in dissenting from the Councell of *Florence*, they doe it by the example of Catholike Diuines and of other Councils, yea of those which are generall, by the iudgement euen of our Aduersary himselfe,

Freewill

The second doctrine which he instances in, is that of *Free-will*; for denying of which, the Manichees and other Heretikes stand condemned by *S. Augustine*, *S. Hierome*, *S. Leo*, &c. Now I answer: That the Huguenots deny it not in the same manner that those Heretikes did, as is to be well seene in the doctrine of the Manichees: who made two necessary Principles; the one of Good, and the other of Euill; and as absolutely denied Freewill, as well of doing ill, as of doing good. But when he can shew, that the Huguenots hold any such opinion, his examples will serue to some purpose.

Further, he confirms the said opinion by foure other Councils, viz: by a particular one held in France, and by those of *Auranches*, *Sens*, and *Constance*. I answer; that it were but an easie matter so to interpret the said Councils, as that the Huguenots need not refuse them in this point of *Free-will*. But for breuities sake, I will not stand to examine them, because that three of them be particular, and for that respect may erre (as I haue shewn before) and may be appealed from: and for the fourth, which is that of *Constance*, though it be called generall by our Aduersarie, yet *Bellarmino* neuertheless receiues but 18. Councils for generall and lawfull, of which ranke this of *Constance* is none.

Children dying without Baptisme.

The third heresiethat he speakes of is, That the Huguenots hold, that little Children dying without *Baptisme*, doe not perish; which that they doe, is plaine enough (saith he.) And how? namely, by so many testimonies of Scripture, by so many Decrees of ancient Councils, by so many resolutions

lutions of holy Fathers ; And yet does he alledge but two passages only out of S. *Austen*, who indeed as he was of this opinion, That Children could not be saued without Baptisme; so held he likewise, *That they could not be saued without the Eucharist*. Which opinion of his, euen our Catholikes themselves doe condemne. Why then should the Huguenots be Heretikes rather for dissenting from S. *Augustine* in one Sacrament, then the Catholikes are for disallowing his iudgement in the other?

The fourth point is the *Worshipping of Images* : which was confirmed by the second Councell of *Nice*, vnto which I may well oppose the Councell of *Franckford*, celebrated since that of *Nice*, which both contemned and condemned the authoritie of that Councell, and the Decrees of it. Neither does it make anything for our Aduersary, to say that these testimonies are of weight enough amongst Catholikes, for there were none in the Councell of *Franckford* but Catholikes, and the Popes Legates themselves, which assisted at it. Obserue then all the Councels which our Aduersary hath rakt together against the Huguenots ; All of which, excepting those three of *Lateran*, *Vienna*, *Florence*, and this last of *Nice*, are particular, and so by consequence, their Decrees may be annulled and reuersed. Further of these foure, which by some are accounted generall ; the first, (that of *Lateran* I meane) was by the sentence of *Scotus* and *Stapleton* (two grand Catholikes) subiect vnto error. The words he vrgeth out of the second, (*viz.* that of *Vienna*) are nothing to the purpose. The Iudgement of the third (which is that of *Florence*) is contrary to the Decrees of the Councels of *Basile* and *Constance*. The last of *Nice*, was condemned by that of *Franckford*: wherefore then, should the Huguenots giue way to the authoritie of such Councels, from whom the Catholikes themselves, yea Councels also of Catholikes themselves, doe disagree, how can wee hope then to conuert them by such proofes ? let vs call a new one then ; let vs giue indifferent audience to their Ministers, let vs refute their Arguments to their very faces, else shall wee neuer recall the Huguenots, that are gone

Worshipping
of Images.

gone astray, into the right way.

2
That the Do-
ctrine of the
Huguenots is
not the same
with that of the
ancient Here-
tiques already
condemned.

*Retraſtat. lib. 2.
cap. 17.*

The second reason, whereby our Aduersarie confutes the Huguenots, is ; Because they agree in doctrine with the ancient Heretikes, viz: the Arrians, who (as *S. Augustine* testifies) reiected, 1. Prayers for the dead : 2. The set times of Fasting : 3. The difference betwixt the Bishop and the ordinary Priest : And 4. with *Iovinian* and *Vigilantius*, in the point of Continencie and Virginitie. 5. Merits and rewards of Saints : 6. The Aderation of Reliques : 7. The Inuocation of Saints : 8. The Election of Meats. I answer. First, That euen as a good Catholike may erre, so may an Heretike also speake truth. *S. Cyprian* and *Ticonius* the Donatist, hauing diuersly interpreted a place of the holy Scriptures, *S. Augustine* reiects *S. Cyprians* exposition, and allowes that of *Ticonius*. So that it is not enough barely to shew that an Heretike hath maintained such and such an opinion, vnlesse he proue withall, that the said opinion is hereticall. Secondly, I haue shewed in the former Chapter, that the vse of things indifferent, might be lawfull in the ancient Church, and yet vnlawfull in this of ours : so that the Huguenots may iustly blame the selfe-same things which the said Heretikes did vnjustly except against, vntill we can proue, not only the things to be the same ; but also make it appeare, that there is not now a greater abuse, in the same things, then there was then. As for the opinions following, the Huguenots will affirme, that neither did the Fathers hold them in the same manner that the Catholikes now doe, nor that the Heretikes tooke the same exceptions to them, that the Huguenots now doe, as we may perceiue by the examples following.

Prayer for the
dead.

First, as for *Prayer for the Dead*, the Huguenots will affirme, That the Church in the beginning, celebrated only a Commemoration of the dead, wherein (as I shewed in the former Chapter) they made mention likewise of the Apostles, and of those that be already gone to heauen. Now this Commemoration (will the Huguenots say) brought forth Prayer for the dead, this Prayer brought forth Purgatorie ; Purgatorie, Pardons ; and Pardons haue brought in pence into the Popes coffers.

coffers. Now (will they say further) that so long as these abuses were not in the Church, if any man had found fault with this custome, of Commemoration, he should but haue shewed himselfe to be of a quarrellsome spirit, yea, they will further say; that petty abuses, especially such as bare a shew of Charitie, might somewhat be winked at, as Prayer for the Dead, had: which custome serued then also to stirre vp in the Pagans, a better esteeme of the Christian faith: but this occasion being now ceased, and the abuses remaining so great, as they affirme them to be; tis now no time to winke at them any longer, nor is there any other meanes left vs, to reforme them, then to take away the first occasion whence they proceeded, thogh in themselues they be of no great consequence. So that if we will shew wherein the Huguenots resemble the other ancient Heretikes, in taking exceptions vnto Prayer for the dead, we must shew withall; how that the ancient Church vsed the same chaffering for Pardons and Indulgences, for the deliuering of soules out of Purgatorie, that the Church of Rome at this day doth. Otherwise, the abuse being not the same, the things deserue not equall blame, and they that finde fault with them, are not alike faulty.

Touching set Fasting daies, I am heartily sorry, that he, in giuing out, that the Huguenots doe herein imitate the ancient Heretikes, giues them aduantage to reuenge themselues vpon vs, and to proue the cleane contrary; namely, that it is we that follow the ancient Heretikes: for *Ensebins* saith, That it was *Montanus the Heretike*, who first set downe the Rules for Fasting, seeing that before that, these set Fasting daies were not ordained with any intention to bind the Consciencs, but for orders sake only. Surely then he was not in the right, who-soeuer found fault with them, seeing there was at first no superstition in them. But since that (say the Huguenots) the superstition is come to that height, that the very day, only because it is such, or such a Saints Eue, is esteemed much holier then other daies. So then, this order hauing occasioned superstition, to auoid this superstition, wee may dispose otherwise of that order.

2

Set Fasting
daies.

Euseb. 5. 16.

F

And

3
Distinction of
Bishops and
Priests.

Comment in cap.
3. Epist. ad
Thim.

4
Mariage and
Virginitie.

5
Merits of
Saints.

And now as concerning the difference betweene the Bishop and the ordinary Priest; the Huguenots will say, that at first they were both equall: but that since then, some amongst them haue beene promoted to dignity aboue the rest, and at last One is become Monarch ouer them all. Now (will the Huguenots confesse) that before this vniuersall Monarchy of the Pope, there was not the like reason to blame the distinction of degrees in Pastors, which in it selfe was tolerable, and not altogether vnprofitable: But they will say withall, that it is most manifest, how that the Fathers neuer held this distinction to haue beene instituted by God, but onely to be a positive ordinance of men, to preserve (as Saint *Ierome* saith) the vnitie of the Church. A Priest (saith he) is the same with a Bishop, but it was afterwards ordained throughout the world that one should be made choice of aboue the rest, for the auoiding of Schisme. Howbeit he confesseth that Bishops are superior to Priests, by Custome rather, then by diuine Ordination.

The fourth point wherein he saith that the Huguenots doe imitate the ancient Heretikes, is concerning *Mariage and Virginitie*, which is but a meere calumny: for the Huguenots affirme not with *Iovinian*, That mariage is simply equall to virginitie; but onely in such a sense as Saint *Augustine* speakes it, who sayes, that he dares not prefer the virginitie of *S. Iohn*, before the mariage of *Abraham*. Nor with *Vigilantius*, that it is vnlawfull to make a Priest, vnlesse he were first married: but with that holy man *Paphnutius*, that it is lawfull for a Priest to be married.

Touching the *Merits and rewards of the Saints*, I cannot tell what he would say: for it he meanes by it, That the Saints receiue a recompence of their good workes the Huguenots will agree to it: but if he meanes it of *workes of supererogation*, laid vp (as they say) in the treasury of the Church, and applied by the Popes Indulgences, vnto the soules of other men; the Catholikes will say, that the Church liued in the same ignorance for the first thousand yeares, that the Huguenots now doe: for it is not long since that for the benefit and aduancement

ment of the Pope, God first revealed this treasure, which had lyen hid so long, and the most gaintull commoditie of Indulgences also.

Now as for *Reliques*, I say that euen the same Saint *Hierome* who wrote against *Vigilantiis* for taking exception to the Reliques of Saints; doth yet in the same booke against *Vigilantiis*, allow of the Eues of Saints: howbeit for certaine abuses committed in the night of the said Eues, which they called the *Vigils*, the Catholikes themselves haue forbidden them: And now fast onely vpon the Eues, although the dayes doe still retaine the names of Eues. So then, we must either grant that the catholikes are condemned by Saint *Hierome*, as wel as the Huguenots; or else that the abuse of things, causes them to be thought blame worthy at one time, and not at another. So that we must not consider whether the Huguenots agree with *Vigilantiis*, in the taking exception to Reliques; but whether there bee not now more abuse in the worshipping of them, then in Saint *Hierome*'s time. For the Huguenots doe not now simply except against Reliques, insomuch that I haue heard diuers Huguenots say, That if they could bee certaine that they had any ancient monument of our Saviour, or of his Apostles, they would make very pretious esteeme of them: and farre more, then of any antique medall or other antiquity of the old Romanes. By greater reason then doe they honour their persons, although they doe not inuoke them being dead, for that (say they) themselves forbade it whilest they liued. So that if we will proue the Huguenots to be enemies to the honour of the Apostles, wee must proue out of their writings, That such was their will to be inuocated. Else will the Huguenots tell vs, That they haue the Saints in more honour then the Catholikes; in that they haue such a care to obserue their precepts now after their deaths: It being euident, That that child who is most carefull to performe his last will and testament, loues his deceased father best, then if he should onely keepe his picture by him.

6. 7
Worshipping
of Saints and
their Reliques.

The eight and last opinion of the ancient Heretikes, is, Election of
the Election of meats. Whereunto the Huguenots will giue the meats.

same answer as to the former obiections: viz. that it was vnlawfull in those times to find fault with the election of meats, and yet lawfull to condemne it now. The reason is, for that it was then an order onely, without enforcing of the conscience to obserue it.

*Durand. l. 6 de
alijs ieiunijs.*

And if any man reply, That they now in the Church doe but the same, and that it is onely the meaner sort of people that account one meat holier then another: and that the better learned Catholikes hold, that the sin of eating flesh vpon dayes whereon it is forbidden, is onely in regard of the ordinance, and not in regard of the nature of the meats: Whence comes it then that *Durandus* that great defender of the ceremonies of our Church, makes vse of this reason, to confirme abstinence from eating of flesh; namely, That fish is a more holy meat: for that in the time of *Noahs* flood, God cursed the earth, and the creatures that it brought forth, but not the waters.

Simile.

See here now the ancient heresies reuiued (as he saith) by the Huguenots: but he is in the wrong: for that they ought not to be ranked amongst the Heretikes, vntill such time as we haue made prooffe, how that the Church of Rome doth not onely agree with the Primitiue in the same things, but also in the very circumstances of the things: for those things which are of themselves ceremonies, are also of themselves indifferent; and it is the right vse or abuse of them, which makes them lawfull or vnlawfull. So that by consequence it may be at this time lawfull, and at another time vnlawfull, to take exceptions to them; Euen as it was not lawfull to breake the brazen Serpent, whilst it was a Sacrament, but necessary to breake it, when it became an Idoll.

CAP. 4.

That the Councell of Trent is not lawfull.



EE are come at last, thankes bee to God, to the holy Councell of *Trent*; a Councell whereof our Aduersary had need to make good account, for that the proofes drawne from the former Councells, concerned onely two or three questions; and those also, rather probable coniectures, then proofes.

But as for the Councell of *Trent*, that openly confutes all the heresies now maintained by the Huguenots; by reason whereof, our Aduersarie toyles himselfe more in the defence of that, then in any other question whatsoever: albeit hee vses not any proofes to confirme it, but answers onely to the obiections of the *Catholike Apologie*, which I find to bee three in number.

The first is; That the Pope did therein take vpon him the office both of Iudge and Partie: and that himselfe conuoked the Councell, and sat President in it.

The second is; That those who sought the reformation, could not bee heard in it.

The third: that for as much as the Huguenots are able to alledge diuers nullities, both in the forme, and also in the definitions of the said Councell; wee are not bound to accept of the ordinances thereof without examination of them: For as much as *S. Iohn* hath commanded vs to try the Spirits.

To the first Obiection: That the Pope was both Iudge and Party, he answers: That the Pope ought not to lose his right of calling Councells, and of being President in them, for that hee had obtained this right 1500 yeres before. The Huguenots can easily cut him off 500 yeres of his time. In all which space, the Pope neither once called any general Councell, nor sat President in it. The first of *Nice* was called by *Constantine* the great. That of *Constantinople* by *Theodosius* Senior: That of *Ephesus*, by *Theodosius* Iunior: That of *Chalcedon*, by

Marcianus, the Emperour. The same also may bee affirmed of those that sat President in them. In the Councell of *Nice* was *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba* in Spaine, President. In the Councell of *Ephesus*, *Cyril*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*. And thus much may suffice for so euident a truth.

* *En denier Pe-
sors.*

Secondly, he answers; That it is nothing repugnant to the equity of a great Prince, to bee both Iudge and Partie. In so much as a Soueraigne Prince is perpetually Iudge, vntill hee bee lawfully declared to haue forfeited his principality, although the suite bee commenced against himselfe. But I say, that there is still a third, which arbitrates betwixt the Prince and his Subiects, when there is a suit betweene them: And although the Iudge bee the Princes Officer, yet may he pronounce sentence against him,* which himselfe cannot repeal; and there is no Prince, but a Tyrant, that would reuerse that iudgment, as the Pope hath done in disanulling the decrees of the Councells of *Basil* & *Constance*, made against himselfe. But admit I should confesse, that a Prince might bee Iudge in his owne cause; yet ought that to be vnderstood in a suit of mean consequence: but when the controuersie be, whether he be a lawfull King or not, we may well assure our selues that he would neuer bee deposed, if hee might bee his owne arbitrator: and of this nature is the first Article of the proceesse against the Pope. The Huguenots deny him to be head of the church; How then I pray shall this Controuersie bee decided, if there be no other Iudge besides himselfe?

Thirdly, hee shewes by examples, that Pope *Marcelline*, *Sixtus* the third, *Symachus*, *Leo*, *Alexander* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, *Cyril*, and *Leo* the first, were Iudges in their owne causes. As for S. *Marcelline* (saith he) when as hee had offered Incense vnto Idols, hee went and accused himselfe in the Councell of *Sinuessa*, and yet durst no man denounce Sentence against him, but all the Bishops cried out with one consent: *Father, iudge thy selfe with thine own mouth.* To which I answer: That it is easie to discover this to be but a forged Councell, which brings in the Emperour *Dioclesian*, talking with S. *Marcelline*

Marcelline at Rome, and enticing him to Idolatry; whereas *Signinus de occi-*
Dioclesian was at the same time at *Nicomedia*, a City of *Bith-*
nia. Secondly, there is a great deale of difference betweene a
 plaine case, & a right in question. For *S. Marcelline* was accu-
 sed of an act, of which he was most apparantly guilty: So that
 the Bishops perceiuing that the Pope denied not the fact, and
 that hee was penitent for it, offered to referre themselves to
 that sentence which hee would giue against himselfe. Iust as
 if a man should say to a Theefe that were taken in the man-
 ner; Thou seeest thy selfe openly guilty, thou knowest like-
 wise the punishment ordained by the law for such offences,
 What thinkest thou that thou hast deserued? Speake a Gods
 name and bee thine owne Iudge: surely this would bee very
 acceptable to all malefactors, to conclude thereupon, that
 they should haue no other Iudges goe vpon them but them-
 selues. His second example is of *Sixtus* the third, who being
 (saith hee) accused of adultery, would haue a Synode called
 by th'Emperours authority. But they would not, nor indeed,
 durst they (saith hee) meddle with his Cause before all the
 Bishops were met, and that they vnderstood the Popes
 pleasure, whether hee were willing to haue them so de-
 cide his businesse, or not. I answer; that this was but a singu-
 lar fauour shewne him by the Emperour *Valentinian*, by
 reason of his innocency: For the Pope himselfe was willing
 that other men should haue bene Iudges in his businesse:
 But it followes not hereupon, that every Pope in euery
 cause ought to claime the same priuiledge; but the con-
 trary rather: viz. That Pope *Sixtus* the fift, who would not
 suffer himselfe to bee iudged by any other man, ought to
 haue bene so, because *Sixtus* the third, who would haue been
 so, was not. What necessity is there in censuring him,
 whose innocency is cleare; and as it was a token of in-
 nocency in the one to submit himselfe vnto censure, so to re-
 fuse all mens verdicts, but his own, is an euidence that hee
 findes himself guilty. But I demand now, whether that singu-
 lar priuiledge granted vnto *Sixtus*, must thenceforth be taken
 for a leading cause or not? If he answers no, then is this instance
 nothing

Tom. 1. Cont. 4.
Lib. 4. Cap. 9.

nothing to his purpose: if yea, The Catholikes will oppose it; for *Bellarmino* confesseth, that in case of heynous crymes, a Councell may be called to sit vpon the Pope: But he thinks not peradventure that *Sixtus* was accused of any heinous crime: which (as I thinke) is the reason that hee names not his fault, because he barely intimates, that he was accused of Adultery; whereas indeed, hee was accused for defiling of a Nunne; which wee, good Catholikes, style not Adultery, but Incest; by reason of the spirituall consanguinity which is betwixt a Priest and a Nunne.

His third example is of *Symachus*, whose consent (saith hee) was required euen for the calling of that Councell, wherein himselfe was accused. The Huguenots will desire no more at the Popes hands, then to doe as *Symachus* did; for, albeit his consent went to the calling of the Councell; yet when it was called, hee tooke not vpon him the part of a Iudge in it, but with all humbleness purged himselfe before the Council of those crimes which hee was charged withall.

The fourth example is of *Leo* the third, of which passage the troath is this: The Romans bearing a spleene to *Leo*, for that *Charlemaigne* the Emperour had inforced them to sweare alleageance to him; out of meere malice laid many slanders vpon him; But *Charlemaigne* appearing at Rome, they, for feare of him, durst not stand to it to prosecute their proofes against him, but at the very first canuasse they all cryed out; *That the Apostolike See could not bee iudged by any man.* Which clamour testifies nothing else, then, *That is the nature of the vulgar, to fall from one extreame to another.* And therefore they having slandered the Pope before out of malice, they afterwards thought to curry fauour againe, by flattering him for feare. But let vs heare what followes: Did not *Arrius* (saith hee) heretofore dispute the case in a matter of faith with *Alexander*? Notwithstanding was this *Alexander* iudge in the Councell of *Nice*. Was not *Cyrl* President in the Councell of *Ephesus*, notwithstanding hee was one of the parties? And who but *Leo* sat President at the Councell of *Chalcedon*, notwithstanding that all the difference then was betwixt him
and

and *Discorsus*? I answer: That the controuersies which then were betwixt *Alexander*, *Cyrl*, *Leo*, and the foresaid Heretiques, concerned them no more, then it did the rest of the Bishops of the Church: whereas that of the Pope is a priuate quarrell, wherein the dignitie of his person is questioned. Againe, *Cyrl* was not President of the Councell, so as that hee could allow or anull the Decrees as hee thought good; but sate only first in order, hauing otherwise but his single voyce; whereas the Pope now a dayes hath his negatiue voice to disanull a whole Councell though generall: yea, and to make his Decretalls vpon what hee lists, without a Councell. As for *Alexander*, he sate neither as Iudge nor President, but only as a priuate Bishop amongst the rest. To conclude, *Leo* came not at all to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and *Anatolius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople* sate President in it.

His concluding reason why the Pope may bee Iudge, is; because (as hee saith) hee is not Iudge alone, but hath diuers Assistants. I answer: That in the latter Councells hee hath beene sole Iudge; and that the rest of the Bishops haue not beene so much his Assistants, as his Vassalls. For, whatsoeuer the Councell decrees, is voyde, without the confirmation of the Pope beere it, (witnesse his abrogation of the Councells of *Frankford*, *Basil*, and *Constance*.) Contrariwise, whensoeuer the Pope makes a Decree without a Councell, it is of as much vertue as the definitions of the most holy Councell, that euer was or can bee. For the Popes Aduocates maintaine, that hee cannot erre in a matter of faith, though hee should giue iudgement without a Councell: and that a Councell may erre, if not confirmed by him. To what purpose then, serue the other Bishops ioined with him as companions, when as he may doe all without them, and they nothing without him?

The second Obiection of the Catholike Apologie, viz. *Obiect. 2.* That the Huguenots had not fayre audience: is first (saith he) confuted by that very booke which the Protestants set forth, intituled, *Causa cur Electores*: For they confesse in that booke that they were *summoned* to the Councell. And wee may read moreouer of many ample safe Conduicts, whereby full li-

berry was giuen to the Protestants, to come to the Councell. And this briefly is his answer; to which I reply:

First, that the booke which hee mentions, deliuiers no reason why they came not to the Councell, but why they iudged, that the forme of proceeding in that Councell was like to bee such, as that their comming thither would haue beene to no purpose. But to what end answers hee, that they were summoned? The Apologie affirmes not, that they were not called, but that they were not heard. For it is not enough for a Iudge to call both the parties before him, if hee suffers but one of them to speake: and iust thus fell it out at that Councell of *Trent*; for *Brentius*, and other Diuines of *Swenia* were sent thither by the Duke of *Wutenberge*, but might not be suffered to dispute when they came there. *Melancthon* also, and other Ministers of *Saxony*, were vpon the way, but turned back againe, hauing receiued intelligence from *Mauritius*, the Electors Ambassador there, that they could not be heard.

Secondly, I reply; that admit that they had beene suffered to dispute, and had been heard, yet were the Conditions altogether vnequal, for they requiring to haue a deciding voice, with the rest of the Councell, according to the form of the safe Conduct graunted to the *Bohemians* by the Councell of *Basil*. But the *Tridentine* Fathers would none of that; refusing to admit of any to haue decisiue voices, but only the Catholike Diuines.

Thirdly, the Huguenots had good cause to suspect the safe conduct; for *Iohn Hus* had also a safe conduct from the Emperour *Sigismund*, to come to the Councell of *Constance*; and yet comming thither, was there burnt.

Obiect. 3:

To the third Obiection, viz: That the Apostle commands vs to trie the Spirits whether they be of God, or no; he answers: That the Apostle there speakes not of such things as be already certaine, and defined in the Church: but of matters rather vp-start & ambiguous, as are those of our trecherous Aduersaries. Soft and faire, not too fast; there is no man affirms, that we must try a thing that is certaine; but that we are not to settle our beleeif vpon it, without proofs that it is certain. For a thing may be certaine in it selfe; neuerthelesse, if it does not appeare

to be certaine vnto vs, we may well make triall of it, for that without trying, we cannot vnderstand the certaintie. But it is (saith he) lawfull to try the Huguenots opinions, because they be new and ambiguous. If then it be lawfull to try the new, tis also lawfull (say I) to try the old ; for two opposite *Opinions* are *Relatiues* ; so that we cannot make demonstration that the new are false, but we must proue withall, that the old are true. And as for the ambiguity of the Huguenots doctrine; if it be ambiguous, then is it not certainly false ; and if their doctrine be not certainly false, then is not the Catholikes certainly true : and consequently, euen by the iudgement of our Aduersarie himselfe, it is lawfull to trie it. But let vs now examine his reasons vpon which he concludes, that it is not lawfull to try the Spirits of the Councell.

First (saith he) if we ought to try them all, then were it lawfull to try the Spirits of the Councell of *Nice*, *Constantinople*, *Ephesus*, & *Chalcedon* : Whereupon it must follow, that we ought to discusse againe the wicked heresies of *Arrius*, *Macedonius*, *Nestorius*, and *Eutiches*, and examine againe the sacred Scriptures themselues, the Oracles of the Prophets, the History of *Moses*, and finally the holy Gospell. At length he concludes, That if things which be determined by the holy Councils, ought to be held for certaine, there is no reason to suffer the Decrees of the Councell of *Trent*, to be called againe into question. I answer: That we ought to hold the Decrees of the former Councils for most certaine ; and yet is it lawfull neuerthelesse, to make question of the determinations of the Councell of *Trent* : to which purpose diuers reasons might be alledged ; how be it, this one may suffice for the present : For that in euery Councell, we ought to deliberate and measure things, before we iudge ; and after this, the iudgement of a Councell which hath duly examined and iudged, (according to the right measure) ought not to be called againe in question. But to know now, whether a man hath truly measured, we must take consideration of the size and manner of measuring by it. Now will the Huguenots say, that the Rule which the Councell of *Nice* did measure by, was only the

Tbcod. l. 10. c. 70.

Scripture, or the written Word, as the words of *Constantine* doe testifie: 'which be these. *All seditious contention set aside, let vs discusse the things in controuersie by the testimonie of the Scriptures diuinely inspired.* The manner of measuring then was, to apply the Doctrine to the said Rule or Scripture, and accordingly to receiue or reiect it, as it was conformable or varying, to or from the said Rule. But now hath the Councell of *Trent* (will the Huguenots say) much failed in all these circumstances.

For, first, it decided before it measured, for as much as euen before their comming to the Councell, they were euery man of them, resolu'd to condemne the Huguenots. Secondly, in examining and measuring of the questions, it measured not by the written Word only, but by *Traditions* also, as it was agreed vpon at the fourth Session of the said Councell. So that it measured sometimes, either without a Rule, or at least by a Rule, very contrary to that of the Councell of *Nice*. Thirdly, admit that it had measured by a true Rule; yet did it not so much apply the doctrine to the Rule, as bend the Rule, to make it fit to the doctrine, viz: peruerted the Scripture by an interpretation forced to their owne opinion: For in the fourth Session, it was decreed, *That no man should giue any other interpretation, then that which was consonant to the doctrine of the Church of Rome.* So that in stead of measuring their doctrine by the Rule, they measured the Rule by their doctrine.

2. Reason.

But he followes it further against the triall of the Spirits; that if we should try all, then should we call againe into question, the very Bookes of the holy Scripture it selfe. I answer no; and that it followes not, that we should call in question againe the bookes approued by ancient Councels, because they reiect some, which are approued by the Councell of *Trent*; seeing that in this particular, the iudgement of that Councell, is suspected euen by Catholikes themselues. For *Sixtus Senensis* a great Catholike, yea, euen since the Councell of *Trent*, hath reiecte'd for *Apocryphall*, the seuen last Chapters of the booke of *Hester*, which were approued by the Councell of *Trent*; which doubtlesse he would neuer haue done, had he

he held it vnlawfull to try the Spirit of the said Councell.

Thirdly he argueth; that if matters already determined and defined, may be brought in question againe, what end then would there be of Controuerlies? I answer, that this reason is not sufficient to stay the triall of Councels, because that this is the way to set an end to Controuerlies: for that it is not enough to dispatch Controuerlies, vnlesse we be sure that this dispatching, is a well ending of them. And so the Arrians might euen as well haue perswaded vs, to rely vpon their packt Councell of *Ariminum*, to giue an end to Controuerlies. To which our Aduersarie can shape no other answer, but that their Councell was not lawfull, and that the Councell of *Trent* was. Well then (say I) that though wee may not examine the Decrees of a Councell, yet may we try whether the Councell were lawfull or not: and for this once, we desire no more aduantage then this; and thus much must be granted vs in despite of the world. For if we ought simply to rely vpon the Authoritie of Councels, which commonly passe for lawfull amongst our Doctors, without any further enquirie; there is no reason wherefore the Græcians should rather assent to the second Councell of *Nice*, which allowed of Images; then to that of Constantinople, made vp of 300. of their owne Bishops, which condemned them.

The fourth Reason, for which he takes away the libertie of trying their doctrine, from the people, is quoted out of the 17. Chapter of *Deuteronomie*, where it is commanded, That men should enquire of the Priests and Leuites, and the Iudge appointed for the time in cases of difficultie. And *Moses* (saith our Aduersarie) addeth not, Try the Spirits of the Priests and Iudges; But if any grow proud, and will not obey the command of the Priests, that man shall die, by the sentence of the Iudges. Nor is this much different from that which our Lord saith in the Gospell of Saint Mathew, The Scribes and Pharisees sit in *Moses chaire*, whatsoever therefore they say vnto you, that obserue and doe. As for *Moses* Commandement, it was giuen vnto the Iewes; whereupon Rabbi Salomon Iarchi concludes, *That we are to beleene whatsoever the Iewish Priests say.* Since then

3. Reason.

4. Reason.

Rab. Sal. Iarchi
in Deuteronom.

then that their Priests interpreted the Prophecies, euen of Christ himselfe, otherwise then we Christians doe. A Iew will say that Christ is not yet come, because their Priests deny it ; and if according to our Aduersaries saying, we ought not to trie the Spirits of their Priests ; I demand then, how he will answer the Iewes, and I will answer him, as he does them; namely, that in the text this clause is inserted, *According to Law*, that is to say, we are to obey their Commandements, so farre forth, ay they are agreeable to the Law ; which how can we know, vnlesse we examine it. So that let our Aduersarie take his choice ; either to confesse, that we are not in this place forbidden to try the Spirits of the Priests, or else to acknowledge himselfe to be a Iew.

5. Reason.

To the place of Saint *Mathew*, because he saith, how that it is not much vnlike : our answer shall likewise be the same. For our Sauour hath not commanded vs to obey the Pharisees in all things, simply; but not to take such scandall at their liues, as that we should refuse to obey them, when they speake well. For, should we simply giue credit to what they bid vs, without tryall of it, why should we beleue that Iesus Christ is the Sonne of God, when as the high Priest said that hee blasphemed in calling himselfe so.

Mat. 17.

His last reason is drawne from the Councell of the Apostles mentioned *Acts 15*. *It seemed good vnto the holy Ghost and to vs*: Whence he concludes, *That Gods Spirit is so infallibly tyed vnto a lawfull Councell, that we ought not to call the definitions of it into question*: nor would Saint *Paul* himselfe (saith our Aduersary) examine the instructions of the Councell of the Apostles : as Saint *Luke* saith, *Acts 16*. *Hee gaue them that to obserue, which was ordained by the Apostles and the Elders which were at Ierusalem*. I would faine aske one of our Catholike Doctors, to what purpose are there so many disputations and consultations at our Councils, if so be that the holy Ghost doth so infallibly direct them? His answer will be, That Gods ordinary prouidence is such, as that hee still assists them with his Spirit, when they for their parts, apply that diligence, which they ought, and not otherwise ; Iust as hee makes not the
ground

ground fruitfull, but when the husbandman tills and sowes his corne in it, and applyes such labour as the soyle requires. And thus much is cleare by this passage: namely, That the Apostles did apply all industry and the aptest meanes, for the resolving of the doubts proposed: for it is said, That after a long disputation *Peter* stood vp: whence a man may conclude; That the holy Ghost is no otherwise promised to a Councell, then conditionally; *viz.* when the Councell doth apply all the meanes and industry on their parts, for the finding out of the truth: and that otherwise it may be destitute of Gods Spirit, namely; when it doth not apply the meanes. So that albeit wee are not to examine the Decrees of that Councell, which hath vsed these meanes; yet may wee enquire whether it hath applied these meanes or no; for that we cannot be otherwise assured that Gods Spirit did assist it. The Huguenots I know well, will require another manner of tryall; not onely of the course in the proceedings, but of the Articles also concluded vpon. But that the Hugenots may not haue a twofold aduantage against vs, we should doe well to shew them: first, That the Councell of Trent hath obserued these lawfull courtes; and then shall wee haue but one thing to doe; which is, To make good the Articles; which are so difficult to be proued, that it would be wisely done of vs, to put it off as long as we can, and first to decide all other differences.

CAP. 5.

That the Councell of Trent hath not as yet been receiued in Fraunce.



VEN as the Kings of France ought to haue no one thing in greater recommendation, then to be the inheritors of the vertues of their predecessors; so should they not likewise bee more carefull of any thing, then to eschew such occasions as might soile the reputation of this vertue, and bewray them to haue cooled in the zeale and piety of
their

their Ancestors: who (as all know) haue euer beene accounted the eldest sonnes of the Church, and the maine vpholders of the Sea Apostolique: and for that one reason of this their zeale, haue receiued more priuiledges and honors, then any other Prince of Christendome whatsoeuer. Now then, seeing that the Councell of *Trent* hath established so many decrees, so directly opposing the former priuiledges and honors; what hath it done more by so doing, then to proclaime to the world, That the Kings at this day haue lesse zeale then their Ancestors had, and are therefore vnworthy to enioy those honors bestowed vpon them. So that the reason why our later Kings haue reiected the said Councell, may bee, for that they could not well approue of that, without reprouing of themselues; nor publish it, without publishing also vnto the world, a shamefull confession of their owne demerits. But to come to the point; I purpose onely to buckle to the objections of the Catholike Apology, which our Aduersary offers to confute; and those be three.

1 That the Kings of France haue euer refused that Councell.

2 That it hath called in question the precedency and priority of place, which was due vnto our Kings, in all assemblies.

3 That there be diuers things decreed in the said Councell, flatly against the liberties of the French Church, and the Maiesty of the King.

1 *Obiection.*

As for the first point; namely, that it hath neuer beene receiued by our Kings: he answers to it in generall; *That this obiection touches not so much the Councell, as it reproacheth the Kings of France. For what else can this meane (saith he) then to perswade all men, that our Kings haue beene Schismatiques, and disobedient to the Uniuersall Church.* I answer, That it is no newes to haue the Kings of France oppose themselues against the Councils of the Church of Rome: seeing that not the Councell of *Trent* alone, hath beene refused by King *Henry* the second, and all his Sonnes who reigned after him; but euen the generall Councell of *Vienna* also, was neuer wholly receiued in France. And euen as King *Henry* the second, forbade his Bishops to be present at the Councell of *Trent*, so
would

would not King *Charles* the seventh suffer his to bee present at that of *Basil*: and yet was not he any whit the more a Schismaticke (as our Aduersary concludes) nor disobedient to the Church vniuerfall. But let vs see now, how hee demonstrates the Councell of *Trent* to haue beene receiued by our Kings: There be certaine Letters (saith he) of *Charles* the ninth yet to be seene, in which he honoureth and reuerenceth that Councell: and in the very same page, to answer that obiection of K. *Henrie* the seconds forbidding his Bishops to repaire vnto that Councell, he hauing nothing else to say; then That it is not so necessary to looke so narrowly into what King *Henry* did at the beginning; for, that the admitting or receiuing of a Councell, ought not to be taken from the beginning but from the ending of it. According to which rule I also answer, That the Letters sent by *Charles* the ninth, before the Councell broke vp, do not proue his approbation of the Councell, because he refused to receiue it, when it was fully ended. For if the reiecting of it by King *Henry* the second before the end of it, does not proue that hee did finally reiect it; no more doth that honor which *Charles* the ninth did it, before it broke vp, proue that he did receiue it.

Reason.

Secondly, *The King* (saith he) shewed the reason why the Bishops of France came no sooner to the Councell; which is one of the most pleasant Arguments that yet I euer heard. For if this be a sufficient reason to proue that the King did receiue the Councell, because he gaue a reason for the absence of his Bishops; then haue the Protestant Princes of Germany also receiued it, because they publisht a whole booke of the reasons that moued them to absent themselues from thence.

Reason.

Thirdly, *The King* (sayes he) sent his Orator and Ambassador the *Sieur de Lansack*, Knight of his owne Order, thither; who in his Maiesties name was at the Councell; with whom he ioyned in commission *Reginald Ferrier* President of the Parliament, and *Guy de Faur*, Iudge Maior of *Tholouse*. A goodly prooffe, The King approoued of the Councell, because hee sent his Ambassador thither. As though the Electors of Germany of the confession of *Ausburgh*, sent not their Ambassadors thi-

Reason.

ther also? Where then lies the force of his Argument, is it in this, that *Monsieur de Lansacke* was a Knight of the Order, or in this, That he was accompanied by *Monsieur du Ferrier & de Pibrac*: For no other sense can I collect out of his words, nor any other prooffe for the receiuing of the Councell; nor is there indeed any other. For the King sent not his Ambassadors to the Councell, to confirme it; but to admonish it, to reforme the abuses of the Church; giuing expresse charge vnto his Ambassadors, that they should sollicite the Fathers, not to decree any thing against the Huguenots; vntill they themselues had first of all reformed the abuses in the Ecclesiasticall Polity: And in case that this were not done, then that they should protest against the said Councell: all which appears in the Letters which the King himselfe sent vnto *Monsieur du Ferrier*. See here then the brieffe of the Kings Commission, and of *Monsieur du Ferrier* and *de Pibrac* their Orations in the Councell: They both, and *Monsieur du Ferrier* especially, often in the Kings name requiring the reformation of the abuses of the Church. Which admonitions for that the Councell did reiect, they according to their Kings command, reiected the Councell, and refused to subscribe to it; nor did the King afterwards receiue it, or the court of Parliament euer publish it; no not after that Saint *Bartholmewes* day, when the time seemed most importune to fauour any thing, that might be preiudiciall to the Huguenots.

The massacre
Anno Dom. 1572

But at least, the Bishops haue approued it. *For when the decrees of it were openly read in the last Session, the Bishops were present and gaue their voyces and suffrages.*

4 Reason.

I answer: first; that so farre was the consent of the Bishops from confirming of the Councell, that quite contrary it discouers the vniust proceedings of it. For those Bishops that gaue their voyces to it, in the last Session; gaue their sentence deliberatiue vpon the points which had beene treated vpon, in the former Sessions vnder *Paulus* the third, and *Innius* the third, before that the said Bishops came to the Councell; a thing contrary to all Ciuill Law, to equity it selfe, and to the customes of all the Parliaments, high courts of Iustice, and other

other Iudiciaries, which out of the persons of many Iudges, are made one body ; In all which, those that haue not beene there all the time, are not suffered to deliuer their opinions.

Secondly, it does not hereupon follow, that the Bishops haue approued of this Councell, because they gaue their consents to the Articles of it : For there is a great deale of difference betwixt those that agree in opinion with the Decrees of a Councell, and those that vphold an opinion, only because the Councell hath decreed it. For our Aduersarie agrees in opinion with the Deuill, in that it is written how God gaue his Angels charge ouer our Lord Iesus Christ: yet he does not I thinke beleue it neuer the more for that the deuill said it. Furthermore, at what time as they gaue their consent to the Articles aforesaid, the Councell was not confirmed by the Pope : now it is our Aduersaries owne *Tenet*, *That a Councell is void, if not confirmed by the Pope* ; and this one reason he makes to serue his owne turne against the Councell of *Basil*. It is (saith he) *a Rule most generally knowne, that Councels are not to be receiued, without the Authoritie of the Pope*. Whereupon it followes, That those who gaue their consents to the said Articles, did at the very same time when they gaue their consents, hold the said Councell, to be as yet, no Councell. So that a man cannot hereby proue, that they did receiue the Councell, because they gaue their voices to the Articles.

To the second Obiection, which touches vpon the precedence of the most Christian King, he answers thus in brieve: *That the Councell was so farre from offering to diminish the Kings Authoritie ; that to the contrarie, the Kings Ambassadors by the vnanimous consent of all, were seated immediatly next after the Emperours ; but the Spanish Ambassador, out of his ranke in another place : to the end, that if it so fell out, that any man were set out of his place, yet should it not be preiudiciall vnto him. He should not haue answered, That the Councell seated the Kings Ambassador next vnto the Emperours, but only, that the Councell did not put him out of his right place. For in the 22. Session, Monsieur du Ferrier, & de Pibrac, being suspicious of the affection of the Councell, went in betimes to take vp their*

2. Obiection.

places, insomuch that the *Count de Luna* Ambassador for the King of Spaine, made publike protestation before the Fathers, how that his place was taken vp: Whereupon *Monsieur de Pi-brac* required, that the said Protestation of his, might not be preiudiciall to his Kings Prerogatiue, whose Ambassadors had euer had the first place, next to the Emperours, as they had at the Councels of *Constance* and *Lateran*: But for all this, the Councell would not vmpire the businesse. And though they tooke not the place away from the Kings Ambassadors, yet our Aduersary confesseth, that they would not pronounce that this place did belong vnto them. For first he saith, *That the Spanish Ambassador was set out of his place.* Secondly, *That if any man were by chance set out of his ranke, yet would not the Councel haue it to be preiudiciall vnto him.* Which is nothing else then to declare, That that place, which they permitted the Kings Ambassadors to keepe for the time for auoiding of contention (and for that they had be-times already taken it vp much against the wils of the Fathers) should not be preiudiciall vnto that right, which they thought to be due vnto the King of Spaine.

Secondly, put case the Councell to haue beene so euently affected (as he would make it) yet did they wrong (say I) neuerthelesse, in forbearing to be vmpires openly in the Kings cause; For there is no man, that can deny a thing most apparant, at the first dash, but he must gaine vpon it, by little and little. So that the first degree to it, is to call a thing into question: nor does any man willfully call a thing into question, vnlesse he purposes absolutely to deny it afterwards. So that it is easily discerned, that the Councell at this time bringing the Kings precedency into question, and making the King of Spaine equall with him, had a plot in it, at the next Councell to giue him the place aboue the King of France.

Lastly, admit the Councell to haue had no such plot vpon him, but only to carry an euē regard to both, yet the wrong remaines neuerthelesse, it being no lesse iniurious to make an inferior equall to his superior, then to make an equall, superior to his equall.

There remains now (saith our Aduersarie) the last Obiection only, viz: That the Councell of Trent hath decreed diuers things against the Realme of France; which is the reason that it is not receiued there. But this Obiection (saith he) serues little to the purpose: For the question is not only about Ecclesiasticall Iurisdiction, but about Faith and Religion. Wherefore although that the Decrees of the Councell for reformation bee not receiued in France, yet the Decrees which treat aboue Faith, are.

Our Aduersary cannot deny, but that the Councell of Trent hath decreed some things against the French libertie; only he answers, that all this hinders not the receiuing of the other Articles which meerey concerne Faith. His owne words are, This Obiection serues to little purpose, for that the question is not "only about Ecclesiasticall Iurisdiction, but about Faith, and Religion. And I say againe, that this answer of his, serues as "little to the purpose; for that we treat not of things that concerne either Reformation, or Faith, but of the Authoritie only by which those Decrees were enacted. That is to say, whether the Iudgement of the Councell of Trent, be in France receiued for a sentence not lyable to be appealed from? and whether they here beleue those Articles wherein they agree with the Councel implicitey, for that the Councell hath decreed them.

For how shall it be proued, that a man who beleuees a thing which another hath reported, did beleue it vpon the reporters credit, vnlesse he be confident withall, that he who reported this, would not report an vntruth, and that he durst trust him in any thing. But France now does not beleue the Councell of Trent in all things: for our Aduersarie himselfe confesses, that it refused the Decrees of the Councel which touched vpon Reformation. Whereupon it follows, that though France doth agree in opinion with the Councel in what it decreed concerning matters of Faith, yet does it not hold this opinion for any regard to the Councels authority, but for some other respect; else might he conclude as well, That the Huguenots do receiue the said Councell, for that they beleue diuers Articles of it, which are against the Anabaptists, and other Heretikes of our time. For euen as they refuse the authority of

the said Councell, in that very same part whereof they receive the Articles; so may we as well refuse the whole Councell, and yet receive all the Articles; there being the same respect from the Articles of one part, to the authority of the same part, as from the authority of the whole, to the authority of the whole. But let vs now marke how he concludes, that this Councell is received in France. *Our Adversaries owne selfe confesseth (saith hee) That this Councell is received by the Bishops: but what man can perswade himselfe, that the Bishops haue another faith and religion from that professed by the King, and all the Catholike people? For, how may the King bee styled, The most Christian, if hee were of a Faith singular from the Bishops? And how should the people bee called, The Lords Flocke, unlessse they acknowledged some Pastors?*

See then, this in briefe is his Argument: The Bishops haue received the Councell; The King and the people haue beleueed the Bishops. Ergo, *The Councell hath bene received by the King, the Bishops, the Clergie, and likewise of all the people of France.* I haue shewen already how he hath not made it good as yet, that the Bishops which then were, haue received it: and for the Bishops and Clergie at this day, though diuers of them for the advancement of the *Holy League*, haue endeavoured to cause the said Councell to bee received; yet might the King and the people refuse it notwithstanding, and yet not cease for all that, to bee of the same faith with them; in so much as the approbation of that Councell is not an Article of faith: for the Councell of *Ephesus* hath expressly prohibited vs the addition of any other Article of faith vnto those which were then received; in which number, the receiving of the *Tridentine Councell* is not. But, supposing that they were not of the same faith, what danger could come of it? *The King (saith he) should not then bee most Christian, nor the people Christ his flocke.* First, as for the King, for as much as this reason is drawne from his Title; I say, that if the King were the greatest Heretike in the world, yet should hee not bee deprived of his Title. *Henry the eight, King of England, received the Title of Defender of the faith from Pope Leo the tenth, for*
writing

writing against *Luther*. King *Edward* the sixt, and the last Queene of famous memory, and the now raigning KING, who haue changed the Religion, for defending of which, King *Henry* receiued this Title, doe still keep the same Style: And by very good right too; for Titles, though personall, and proper only to the first of the Race that receiue them, (as *Catholike* to *Ferdinando* King of *Arragon*; *Defender of the faith*, to *Henry* the eight King of *England*) yet doe they descend vnto their successors, as ornaments onely annexed to their State. So that it is not *Philip* of *Austria*, who is Catholike in that sense, but the King of *Spaine*. For, if wee consider of Kings onely in point of Religion, the King of *France* may be as good a Catholike as the King of *Spaine*; and the King of *Spaine* as good a Christian as the King of *France*; and yet the Title of *Christian* belongs onely vnto the one, and the Title of *Catholike* to the other.

But aboue all, is this reason ill applied against the King of *France*, for that *Christian* is not a title to distinguish one Christian from another, but to distinguish them all from Pagans; and in this sense is it giuen to the King of *France*, as to the first King of *Europe*, that abolished Paganisme, and who still had the most warres of all with the Sarazens, enemies of the name of Christ. True it is, that this title might incline him the more to imbrace that doctrine which is best, but for that it hath not beene hitherto agreed vpon which of the two is the best, wee must not proue one doubt by another. For the Huguenots may as well conuert this reason to perswade the King to reforme the Church, as the Catholikes vse it, to incline him to maintaine the Romish Religion: howbeit there is not any thing that the King can doe, more worthy of this Title of his, then to doe both; that is to say, to maintaine the *Romane* Church, and to reforme it. Neither is there any contradiction in these two, seeing there is no better meanes to make the Iron endure long, then to scowre away the rust; nor to maintaine the Church of *Rome*, then to reforme the abuses of it. Neuerthelesse, to establissh such a course, that any of the Iron be not scraped away, in stead of the rust; and yet

see

see that it bee bright scowred; there is no safer meanes then to doe quite contrary to that which our Aduersary aduise; viz. To let their Councell of *Trent* sleep, and to call another, wherein both parts may haue indifferent hearing: by which meanes, if so bee that there bee any corruption in the Church of Rome, it may bee seene into and purged. And if there be any error in the doctrine of the Huguenots; they may bee e-
 victed and instructed in a better faith. And this were the way to reunite vs all in one faith; and this would bee an act in-
 deede well worthy a most Christian King.

3 But descend wee now to the people: *How should they* (saith he) *bee the sheepe of Christs flocke, if so bee they acknowledg not any Pastors?* I answer; That they may well enough acknowledge their Pastors, though they beleue not iust as the Pastors of their Countrey doe. For that no man is obliged to build his faith, but vpon an infallible foundation: and it is confessed by the Catholikes themselves, that all the Bishops in a whole countrey may erre in point of faith. So that the people are not alwaies obliged, to ground their faith vpon that of their Bishops, and consequently may bee of another faith, and yet bee of the flocke of *Iesus Christ*: As in very troath, our Sauour does not call them his Sheep which heard the Bishops, but those that heare *his* voyce; which is, the word of God.

Let vs now looke vpon his conclusion: *And so* (saith hee) *is the Councell honoured of the King, the Bishops, the Clergie, and likewise of all the people of France.* Admit it were so; yet for all this does it not follow, that it is receiued in *France*, vnlesse hee can shew withall, that all the Estates doe receiue it: that is, The Church, the Nobility, and the People: But hee makes no mention of the Nobility, but onely of the Church, and the third Estate, so that at the most it is receiued but of two of the three Estates: which may be the cause that our Aduersary, to keep vp the number diuides the Church into two parts, viz. Bishops, and Clergie: *The Councell* (saith hee) *is receiued of the Bishops, the Clergie, and likewise of all the people of France.* Which is a new diuision of the Estates, neuer, as I
 perswade

perswade my selfe, heard of before. Iudge then what iust occasion the Nobilitie of *France* now haue to reiect this Councell, when as those who would haue the Councell receiued, doe reiect the Nobility.

CAP. 6.

That the Huguenots may very rightly bee accounted members of the Catholike, Apostolike, and Romana Church.



His Chapter at the first blush, seemes to treat of the same Argument that the first does; for hauing there proued it, That the Huguenots are of the same religion with vs Catholikes, it may follow also, that they bee of the same Church too: And yet to my thinking, these two Chapters may very well bee parted; not so much in regard of the difference of the nature of the subiect, as of the humours of the persons. For commonly, when a Huguenot would draw a Catholike to his opinion, he begins euermore with the particular Controuerlies; and so, vpon the purity of his doctrine, hee inferres the verity of his Church.

A Catholike, on the other side, when hee would winne a Huguenot, beginnes still with the Church, and so by the verity of the Church, concludes the purity of his doctrine: and commonly, when either of them gets the other out of this tracke, they are to seeke; which is one of the reasons that they cannot satisfie the aduerse partie. For he that would perswade another, must not begin with that principle which to him seemes best, (though indeed it be so) but with that which seemes best in his opinion whom hee desires to perswade; otherwise, hee shall but lose his labour.

For, when a Huguenot shall haue vrged a thousand passages of holy Scripture, to proue the truth of his owne particular assertion, hee shall not bee a whit the nearer; and why? For that a Catholike will say instantly with himselfe; What though I cannot answer him, yet another may: and if I am to
I beleue

beleeue nothing which I am not able to maintaine by disputation, then should I not beleeue the *proceeding of the holy Ghost, the union of both Natures in Iesus Christ, the mysteries of the holy Trinity*: all which I haue beleeued, without being able to maintain them, or so much as vnderstand them. And euen so, the authority of the same Church which makes mee beleeue these mysteries, without being able to maintaine them, makes me also to beleeue the holy sacrament of the Altar, Purgatory, &c. without being able to maintaine them. So that if a Huguenot proceeds no further, & does not shew a reason how a man may be assured of these mysteries without the Churches authority; or else (which I hold more reasonable) why wee ought wholly to relye vpon the authority of the Church in one point, and not in another; hee shall neuer say ought to the purpose. Nor can the Catholikes haue any happier success in their perswasions; for when they talke to the Huguenots of the Church; how the Church saies this, and the Church saies that, and the Church cannot erre: They who are not brought vp to such kinde of phrases; and who found their faith vpon this perswasion, *That the Scripture is cleere on their sides*; What care wee (will they say) what the Church saith, so long as wee agree in opinion with the word of God. So that a Catholike shall neuer bee able to perswade them to any thing, if hee beginnes not at their foundation, and proue, that the Scripture makes not so clearely for them, as they imagine it does: and then when they once perceiue, that they cannot confute the Catholikes by Scripture, they will bee compell'd to confesse; That a man can haue no assurance of his faith, without submitting his own iudgment to the iudgment of the Church: which (as wee say) according to Christs owne promise, is infallibly accompanied with the holy Spirit. For mine own part, although it bee not my intencion to entice any man, either to one Religion or the other, but to qualifie onely the passions of men: yet for feare that I should commit the same errour in this *Treatise of Pacification*, which they often doe in the course of their perswasions, I thought good to subioine this Chapter also; to the end that my reasons

reasons might be drawne from the principles of both Religions. And thus hauing proued in the first Chapter, by examination of the particular questions, according to the Huguenots method, That they be no Heretikes ; I was also desirous to adde this Chapter, that according to the Catholikes manner of proceeding (that is as much to say, as according to the Nature of the Church) I might also proue them (the Huguenots) to be no Heretikes. For, it were but labour lost, to tell many of our Catholikes, that the Huguenots hold many of the fundamentall points of faith aswell as we, seeing they take not the skantling of an heretike by his opinions, but only by this marke, *That he is out of the Church*, vnderstanding thereby no other Church, then that which we call *Catholike, Apostolike, and Romane*: excluding all those out of the Church, to whom these three titles may not be giuen, what opinion soeuer they be of. For which reason I resolued to proue, that these three titles doe belong vnto the *Huguenots*.

And first touching the title of *Catholike* ; the Church is called Catholike in three respects. First, *in regard of it selfe.* *Catholike.*
 2. *In regard of the Iewes.* 3. *In regard of Heretikes.*

Now the Church is called Catholike in regard of it selfe, because in the vniuersalitie thereof, it comprehends all times, and all places, viz: the whole number of the Elect, as well those who haue beene since the beginning of the world, and are now departed and triumphant in heauen, enioying everlasting blisse; as those that are ordained to the like blessednesse whether now aliue, or to be borne hereafter. Which definition is founded vpon the Scriptures; for *S. Pauls* words are; *The Church of the first-borne, which are written in Heauen*: and who are written in heauen, but the Elect? from whom thereprobates are in this specialty distinguished, *That their names are not written in the Booke of the Lambe.* The Church then consists of the Elect, who are not restrained to any place or time, For *Iesus Christ hath redeemed with his blood* (saith Saint *Iohn*) *Out of euery kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.* With which definition the Fathers iointly consent; *All they* (saith Saint *Augustine*) *which are holy and sanctified,* which

^I
How the Church is called Catholike in respect of it selfe.

Heb. 12. 23.

Reuel. 13. 18.

Reuel. 5. 9.

^I
August. de Civitate Dei. lib. 1. cap. 12.

*Greg. Mor. in
Iob. lib. 28. cap. 9.*

which are, haue beene, and shall be, are Citizens of the heavenly Ierusalem : And S. Gregory the Pope (that my prooffe may be the more authentickall) saith, That all the Elect are embraced in the bosome of the Church, and all the Reprobates are without. And yet was poore Iohn Husse burnt for an Heretike, for affirming the very same.

O wicked Catholikes, that haue made a man to be burnt for an Heretike, for affirming no more, then what a Saint had done, and (which is more) then a *Pope* had said before him. So then in this signification, neither the Church of Rome, nor that which themselues call the *Reformed Church*, can properly be called the Catholike Church, but only parts of it. Nay, we cannot truly affirme, that they be parts of the Catholike Church; but that God hath both in the *Romane Church*, and in the *Reformed*, some that be members of the Catholike Church. Which is as much to say, as that diuers shall be saued in both Churches. Like as there were many amongst the Iewes at the comming of Iesus Christ, and at this day be in the Greeke Church, and in *Prester Iohns Country*, which doe embrace the Christian faith, without acknowledging the Pope. So that if we appropriate the title of Catholike to the *Romane Church* only taking it in this signification; it must needs follow, that either all the Catholikes are elected (though the Catholikes themselues write that diuers Popes haue beene damned) or else, that no Iew was euer saued before Christs comming, and that God hath not had his Church at all times: or that no Greeke nor Affrican can be saued in our time; and then God should not haue his Church in all places. Again, if we attribute not this title of Catholike only to the Church of Rome, I can see no reason why the reformed Church should be more excluded then the rest. To be brieft, when we passe our censure vpon any man, whether he be of the Catholike Church, or not; we must speake either according to Faith, or according to Charitie. If according to Faith, we cannot say, that such or such a man is a Catholike, *because it is God that knoweth who are his*, saith S. Paul: But if wee passe our iudgment according to charity, this will haue vs esteeme all those

2 Tim. 2. 19.

to bee of the true Catholike Church, which bee of the visible; of which I will next speake, and shew how it may bee termed Catholike.

2 The Church, as I haue proued already, comprehends all the Elect, those as well that be already in heauen, as those that are yet on earth, and remaine mingled among the wicked; which last, though generally more in number, yet the Elect beare the name of the better part. So that both good and bad, which make an outward profession of the true faith, are reputed members of the true Church. According to the Parable of the net, which *held the bad fishes as well as the good.* Mat. 13. This Church was separated from the rest of the Gentiles, with a partition wall (as it were) and before the comming of Christ pend vp in one country, and restrained to the Family of Israel: But since Christs comming, *This partition wall is* (as Ephes. 2. 14. *S. Paul saith*) *broken downe; so that neither Jew nor Greeke are excluded.* And by reason of this difference, that the Iewes in those dayes had onely this priuiledge, and that now no one particular country hath it more then another, the Church is called *Catholike*: that is to say, Spread all the world ouer. And for that shee is so vniuersall, shee is diuided into particular Churches: As in Saint Pauls time, into the Church of Ephesus, of Rome, of Galatia, of Corinth, &c. and no one of these Churches hauing any priuiledge more then another, they were all together called *The Church Catholike*: not that it is alwayes euery-where, but for that no country is excluded, and no place priuiledged. So then, no place being excluded, there may be other Churches besides that of Rome; and no place being priuiledged, euen Rome it selfe may be cut off from the Church.

3 Thirdly, the Church is called *Catholike*, in respect of the Donatists, who denied the Church to bee dispersed all ouer the world; but held it to be coopt vp in Affrica: where-vpon it came to passe, that those Churches which held the contrary, were called the Catholike Churches. Euen as at this day, these Churches that hold, the Church to haue need of reformation, are called *The Reformed Churches*: Which is

2
How the Church is called Catholike, in respect of the Iewes.

3
How the Church is called Catholike, in regard of Heretikes.

the reason why the more ancient Fathers neuer vsed this terme *Catholike*, to distinguish the pure Churches from the hereticall; but called them *Orthodoxall*. But in procelle of time, by reason that the Orthodoxe Churches held, that the Church was Catholike or Vniuersall; these two words *Catholike* and *Orthodoxall*, were taken in one and the same signification: so that at last, this title of Catholike, was not onely giuen to the Church, to distinguish the *Orthodox* from the *Donatists*, but also from all other Heretikes. For a Catholike in proper speech is not opposit to all sorts of Heretikes, but to the Iewes onely and the Donatists. But for as much as custome is the master of words (as we see in this word *Tyrant*, anciently taken in good part for a King, and now onely for a bad King) this word *Catholike* is taken contrary to his nature, in the signification of a pure Church; in such a sense as that a particular Church may be called a Catholike Church, and more or lesse Catholike, proportionably as it is more or lesse pure. So that the question betweene the Catholikes and the Huguenots, lies not in this point, *viz.* Which of the Churches is the Church Catholike; but whether of them is most Catholike, and which most corrupted: for in some degree both of them may be Catholike, so long as they hold the substance of faith, (as I shewed in the first Chapter) and both of them in some sort may be corrupt: it being a thing most certaine, That euery visible Church may haue errors, more or lesse. *The Church* (saith Saint Bernard) *as long as shee is in the tabernacle of this body, hath not attained unto the perfection of beauty, and is not therefore absolutely faire*: For it is the priuiledge of the Church Triumphant onely to be faire, and as S. Paul saith, *without spot or wrinckle*. True it is indeed that the Church is sometime called faire, but this is euer comparatiuely: wherefore the Bridegroom in the *Canticles* saith of his Spouse (which is the Church) that shee is the fairest of women: that is, *not simply faire* (saith S. Bernard) *but the fairest among women*. And for that selfe same reason, is she in one and the same verse, styled both blacke and faire. *I am blacke* (saith the Spouse) *but I am comely*.

Bernard in Cantica, Sermon. 38

Ephes. 5.

Cant. 1.

I am not ignorant how that the Ancients also did vse this word *Catholike*, for a distinction from an Heretike, in another signification; which in truth was according to the proper interpretation of the word, taking *Catholike* or *Uniuersall*, for a marke of the true Church. For which reason in the ancient Church, when as the whole visible Church yet retained the faith receiued from the Apostles, and that some part of it became corrupted; for the exact discerning vnto whether side we ought to leane, *Vincentius Lyrinensis* gaue *Vincent. Lyr. l. 1.* this Rule: *What else should we doe (saith he) but prefer the safety aduers. hereses, of the body, before a rotten member.* And therefore, for that the body of the Church was at that time sound, all the Church was called *Catholike*, for so much this word *Body*, as well as that word *Catholike*, implies an vniuersality; so that the distinction of *Catholike* and *Heretike*, serues but to distinguish the sound body, from a corrupted member. But so soone as the body it selfe became corrupted, then this rule and distinction failed. For which reason *Vincentius* makes a difference betweene a *Catholike* in place, and a *Catholike* in time. And euer when a *Catholike* in place is not a sure marke, he hath recourse vnto a *Catholike* in time. *But (saith he) if any new Eodem lib. adu. infection goes on, not onely to corrupt a part, but the whole Church, heres. then must we cleaue to antiquity.* So that the difference between the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots*, lying in this point, Whether the body of the Church be corrupted or no? wee must not speake of the Church which is *Catholike* according to place, but according to time. *And that Church is Catholike (saith Vincentius) which holds that religion which hath beene euer hitherto embraced.* And to discern which Religion hath beene alwayes embraced, when as the body of the Church, or the visible Church (as saith the same *Vincentius*) is corrupted; we must still haue recourse vnto Antiquity, and say with *Tertullian*, *Illud verum, quod primum: That is truest which is ancientest.* So as that is the *Catholike Church*, which agrees in faith with the more *Primitive Church*. So that if wee *Tertul. lib. de prescript. adu. heres.* would discusse it, whether the *Catholikes* or the *Huguenots* be most properly the right *Catholikes*; wee must consider first,

first, whether of them best holds of the faith of the Apostles: and next, of that of the ancient Doctors and Councils of the Church.

As for the Title *Apostolike*; The Church may bee called *Apostolike*, as well in regard of the *Writings*, as of the *Preaching* of the Apostles. As for their *Writings*, those Churches which imbrace the doctrine deliuered in them, are intituled *Apostolike*; yea, and more or lesse *Apostolike*, as they do more or lesse agree, or disagree, to or from the said doctrine. So that the word *Apostolike* is all one with the word *Orthodox*, or with *Catholike*, taken in the last signification. And if the Church of the Huguenots may bee intituled *Catholike*, or *Orthodox*, they may also by the same reason be called *Apostolike*: nay, and more properly *Apostolike* then *Catholike*. For the visible Church, being (as I haue shewed) not absolutely, but comparatiuely, more or lesse *Catholike* or *Apostolike*: the Huguenots, though they may offend in default, and so be lesse *Catholike* rather; yet in this, they offend rather in the excelsse, and are too *Apostolike*: as being so strict, that they will readily beleeue nothing, but what the Apostles haue written.

2.
Apostolike.

Secondly, those Churches were called *Apostolike*, which were instructed by the liuely voice of the Apostles, and where the Apostles haue had their seats, as Ierusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria, &c. where the Apostles *Peter*, *James*, *John*, and *Marke* the Euangelist, sate; and are therefore from all Antiquity styled *Apostolicall Sees*, as well as Rome: howbeit that this signification is rather an ornament then a mark, of a pure Church. For Antioch, Alexandria, and other Churches of Greece, where the Apostles preached; haue either altogether forsaken the name of Christ, or are at the least (according to the Catholikes Tenet) quite cut off for Schisme and Heresie, from the communion of the true Church: and France, Spaine, Poland, Germany, England, and Denmarke, where the Apostles neuer had any Bishopricks, haue sithence beene the true Churches. So that in this signification a Church may bee pure, and yet not bee *Apostolike*; and a Church which is *Apostolike*, may be impure.

The last title, though first in estimation with the Catholiques, is that of *Roman*; which I have obserued to haue beene taken in three seuerall sorts. First, the *Roman Church* is only taken for the Diocesse of *Rome*, and was in the beginning, for the Citie of *Rome* alone. As in *S. Pauls* time, who inscribed an Epistle seuerally to *Rome* alone, as he did likewise to those Churches of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Galatia*, &c. For had the Church of *Rome* beene euery where at that time spread abroad, he had not needed to haue written to other Churches seuerally, because that in writing to that of *Rome*, he had then written to them all: And yet would our people needs make vse of this Epistle, to proue by it, The *Roman church* to be the catholique Church, because that in it, *S. Paul* saies, *Your faith is spread abroad in all the world*: as if *S. Paul* had not said the same to the Church of *Theffalonica*, *Your faith which you haue to God-ward is spread abroad*. But had the Church of *Rome* beene (as they would haue it) esteemed by *S. Paul* as all one with the Catholique; without all doubt his Epistle to the *Romans* had beene intituled Catholique, as well as those of *S. Iohn*, *S. Peter*, *S. Iames*, and *S. Iude*, which are therefore stiled Catholique, for that they were written to the Catholique Church. Now taking the *Roman Church* in this signification, I confesse that not the *Huguenots* Churches alone are separated from the *Roman Church*, but all other catholique Churches besides: so that to this day they in *France* make a distinction of sundry customes of the *Roman Church*, and of the Church *Gallicane*.

3.
How the Huguenots may be said to be of the Roman Church.

Rom. 1. 8.

1 Theff. 3. 8.

2.

Secondly, the Church of *Rome* is taken for the *Westerne Church*, inasmuch that the *Roman*, *Latine*, and *Occidental Church*, doth signifie one and the same thing, to distinguish it from the *Greeke* and *Easterne Church*; iust as the Empire of the East, and the Empire of the West, were called the Empires of *Rome* and of *Constantinople*, because that these two Cities were the chiefe seats of the Empire: and so by reason of the dignitie of the Citie of *Rome*, which was the seat of the Emperours that reigned in the West, all this *Westerne part*, was called the *Roman Empire*, and all the *Westerne Church* the *Roman Church*: that is to say; The Church contained vnder the *Roman Empire*. So then, if we call it the *Roman Church*, for distinguishing it from the *Greeke* and *Easterne Churches*; then also may the *Huguenots Churches* be members likewise of the *Roman Church*, for that they be *Westerne*, and not *Greeke*, nor *Easterne Churches*.

Churches. If in respect of the *Roman* Empire, (taking the *Roman* Empire largely, as it was) they also be vnder the Empire, and by consequence, vnder the Church. But taking the Empire as it now is, then may the Churches of *Germanie*, some of which haue shak't off the Popes authoritie, be more properly stiled members of the *Roman* Church, than *Rome* it selfe; inso much as *Germanie* and not *Rome*, is at this day called the *Roman* Empire.

Lastly, the *Roman* Church is vnderstood, for all those, that doe in Faith communicate with the Church of *Rome*: that is to say, those that be of the *Romish* Religion. I demand then their meaning, whether they vnderstand by the *Romish* Religion, those points in which the *Huguenots* doe agree with vs, or those wherein they disagree from vs, or both the one and the other.

If those points wherein they agree with vs; then they are directly of the *Roman* faith. If for the points only wherein they dissent, then are the beleefe in the Trinitie, and all the Articles of the three Creeds, of the Apostles, of *Nice*, and of *Athanasius*, wherein they doe agree, no Articles of the *Romish* Religion.

But if they take the *Roman* Religion, for all the points of it together, both for those wherein they doe agree, and all the other too; I demand once againe, whether so exact an agreement in all points, be required or not? And if not; then seeing that the points whereupon the *Huguenots* be agreed with the *Catholikes*, be for number more, and for importance greater, than those questions are, vpon which they disagree; they may yet neuerthelesse be reputed to be of the *Roman* Church and Faith: forasmuch as things for the most part take their Denomination from the better part. Euen as we vse to say; those people are of a sanguine complexion, in whom bloud is predominant, although their temper be of other humours too. But if we affirme, that no man can be of this Church, vnlesse he beleeueth all, and the selfe-same, that the Church of *Rome* doth; then say I, that whilest we goe about to proue, that the *Huguenots* be not of our Church, we shall shew withal, that we haue not any one man, who is absolutely of the Church: inso much as that there is no one man, learned or vnlearned; that beleeueth all, iust as the Church doth.

For it is the credit of our Doctors, to maintaine singular opinions by themselves; which may be the reason why *Bellarmino*, the greatest

greatest Aduersarie to the *Huguenots*, accuses all the *Catholikes* that euer were before him, of Error, and those especially, which haue written against the *Huguenots*; as *Genebrard*, *Pighius*, *Eckius*, *Hofius*, *Canus*, *Caictane*, *Scotus*, *Durand*, *S. Bonauenture*, *S. Thomas*, *S. Damascene*: (for he spares not the Saints neither) the like courte-lic also shewes he to the Ancient Fathers, *S. Augustine*, *S. Bernard*, *S. Chrysostome*, and much adoe he hath to let *S. Paul* alone. So that amongst so many dissentions, either hath the Church beleueed nothing at all, or else hath the Church beleueed them altogether, that is to say, contradictions; or else that the Church hath beleueed but only some of them: and perchance, they haue all beleueed contrary to what the Church beleueeth.

Come we now to the common people, and they vnderstand not the one halfe part of that, which we teach them: and when wee tell them of such points of Diuinitie, wherein they were neuer brought vp; their fancies framing *Idea's* vnto themselues, vpon what they heare, make them conceiue *Chimara's* in their braines, and to beleue the quite contrary to what the Church doth, before they are well aware of it.

But our *Catholikes* now haue found out a remedie for that; which is, *That an implicate Faith is enough for the common people*, which is as much to say, as to thinke only, & to beleue only as the Church doth, though they doe not so indeed. So then, seeing that an implicate Faith is, To beleue the contrary, and yet thinke they beleue the same; if we could but once perswade the *Huguenots*, that they doe verily beleue as our Church of *Rome* doth in euery thing, although indeed they doe not, they shall be of our Church. See then, if I haue not taken a better method to conuert them, than any other *Catholikes* haue yet light vpon. They labour to conuert them to our Explicite faith, which were to make them beleue all the particulars of our Faith. And I, perceiuing them altogether vncapable of this Explicite Faith, haue endeouored my selfe to make them embrace the Implicate Faith, which is much the easier of the two, and to perswade them to beleue, that they doe already beleue, as our Church beleueeth: and consequently, that their Faith is the same, and their Church the same. That so by this perswasion they may proue, if not so good *Catholiques* as the Priests, yet at least, as good *Catholiques* as the people.

But to returne againe to my purpose; it appeares by what hath beene said; that if we stand for so strict an vnion in euery point, then will not the Catholiques themselves, neither learned nor vnlearned, be of the *Roman Church*. Forasmuch as the learned *will not* beleue as the rest doe, and the vnlearned *cannot*. And would we content our selues with an essential vnion, the *Huguenots* may then well be of it. Whereupon it followes, that we must needs yeeld to one of these; That either the *Huguenots* are of the *Roman Church*, or else that the *Catholikes* are not.

FINIS.



Errata in some Copies.

Pag. 94. l. 9. for *Amberitie* (in the first place) read *Angles*.

